

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXVII. — JANUARY, 1912 — No. 145.

THE CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION IN CANADA.

THE defeat of the late Laurier Government in Canada after a tenure of office, with large majorities, of fifteen years (1896-1911), has been and is still being ascribed, by the unsuccessful party especially, to many and often to mutually inconsistent causes. So much is this the case, indeed, that any attempt, however impartial in purpose and intention, to account for it, resolves itself, to use a homely simile, into an exhibition of fancy skating on the thinnest of thin ice, a performance which is risky in proportion to its exhilaration—to the onlooker. The attendant perils are, in the present case, twofold; there is the danger not only of running counter to the political convictions of others, but also to their religious preconceptions. It has here been considered better, therefore, for sufficiently obvious reasons, to set down a chronicle of events, and of the inferences drawn from them by the one side and the other, rather than to give what must, at the best that can be said of it, be a personal and possibly biased account of a change which can only be described as being as momentous as it was, apparently, unexpected, certainly by those in power when it took place.

Written, however, as this article is, for a review wherein that which is of Catholic interest comes before all other conceivable considerations, national or political, the manner in which the change of government is likely to affect the welfare of the Church in Canada must, necessarily, hold first and most important place. Here also plainness and honesty of speech constitutes the chief risk referred to—that of running counter to the convictions and

preconceptions of others. It may amount, indeed, to giving unwitting and certainly unintentional offense; but the danger must, unfortunately, be incurred, if an accurate account of the matter is to be given.

Canada, on the eve of the election of September 21, stood, according to President Taft, "at the parting of the ways," and reciprocity was the last and most effectual alternative to imperial preference. The appeal to loyalty has since been condemned by the leader of the defeated party and by his American friends as an appeal to prejudice and to sentiment. Sentiment, however, plays as large a part in politics as in religion, and it must be admitted that a perfectly honest, even if mistaken, conviction that reciprocity was actually the first step on President Taft's path towards annexation did unquestionably influence a very large number of voters, not less on the Liberal than on the Conservative side.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, moreover, it may be respectfully suggested, is the last man who should condemn the influence of sentiment in politics, even where, as in the present instance, it has worked to his undoing. What other force, it may be asked, than nationalist sentiment has given him an unquestioned and overwhelming majority of votes in his own Province, in one election after another, and made a "solid Quebec" the arbiter of Canada's constitutional destiny for fifteen years?

But whether it were sentiment or prejudice which led thousands of Sir Wilfrid's followers to reject reciprocity; whether as the result of a "campaign of scandal" or of righteous indignation at extravagance, not to say dishonesty and mismanagement in government, a Liberal majority of forty was changed in one day to a Conservative majority equally great, and eight members of the Laurier Cabinet failed of reëlection at the polls.

In respect of what may be defined as religion in politics, religious prejudice has been credited, by the vanquished, at all events, with a large share in their defeat. Mr. Lemieux, the late Postmaster General, a French-Canadian and a Catholic, attributes it largely to the official attendance of the Laurier Cabinet—its Catholic members, that is—at the Eucharistic procession in Montreal last year, but not less—"tell it not in Gath"—to a certain famous sermon preached on that occasion by a distinguished English ecclesiastic. An Ontario member, on the other hand, who is endorsed by Mr. Oliver, the late Minister of the Interior, ascribes it to the publication of the *Ne Temere* decree, and the consequent fury of the Orange lodges.

To this extent, at all events, the Church appears to be involved in the issues of the election of September, 1911. That the causes

referred to were, in a measure, responsible for a certain number of votes cast against the Laurier Government there can, I honestly believe, be no doubt whatever. Anti-Catholic prejudice of a strenuous "early Victorian"—shall we say?—type is distinctly prevalent in Ontario. It was not lessened, as may be imagined, by the fact that a "French Papist," open to the obvious charge of "truckling to the Pope"—whatever that may mean—was at the head of the government of "a British and Protestant Dominion." Nor did the "hommages"—which is not homage, but something far more innocent—offered by the acting Governor, another "French Papist," to His Eminence Cardinal Vannutelli serve the cause of those who were held responsible for this "act of submission to Rome." In so far, therefore, as this prejudice must be taken into account, and it is by no means easy to define the limits or extent of its influence, the change of Premiership from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Borden, from a "French Papist," as aforesaid, to a "British Protestant," ought, it should seem, to be to the advantage of the Church in Canada. For Mr. Borden, though he will doubtless be compelled to "walk delicately," after the fashion of the late King Agag, does not come into office "suspect" on account of his name, his race or his creed.

Mr. Borden's Cabinet, like all that have preceded it, has made the inevitable concessions, in respect of its composition, to that sectionalism, racial, religious or local, which appears to be a dominant factor in Canadian politics, whether federal, provincial or municipal, to the extent of being regarded as a necessary evil. The Catholic portion of the community has, at all events, fully as adequate a representation in the present Conservative as in the late Liberal Administration, a fact which, taking the Church's temporal interests and welfare as of supreme moment to all her loyal children, cannot fail to be gratefully acknowledged as indicating the generous fairness of the new government of a Dominion wherein Catholics, numerous as they are, nevertheless constitute the minority. The reproach so freely made by their defeated opponents that it is "a coalition" of Tories and Nationalists, of Catholics and Orangemen, need not be taken seriously, unless as further evidence of impartiality, of a determination to deal justly and fairly with all the elements, racial and religious, which go to make up the growing Canadian nation.

Nor does the fact that the eternal school question, whether in Ontario or in Manitoba, bulks largely among the problems confronting the new Administration, render this compromise and counterbalance of diverse, but not necessarily antagonistic elements of any less, but rather of greater interest to Catholics, whether in

the Dominion itself, in the United States or in Great Britain. It is true that, to quote the *Conservative Gazette*, of Montreal, of November 24, "the trouble is not in the schools, but in the minds of the politicians who are trying to use them to catch narrow men's votes;" yet, unfortunately, politics may be defined as the *damnosa hæreditas* of primary education, the *fons et origo* of most of its miseries, its failures and its difficulties. Now, the extension of the boundaries, said to be agreed upon, will most assuredly reopen the school question in that Province, for the simple reason that the majority of schools in the region to be annexed to Manitoba are French and Catholic.

To say that the question will be reopened is, indeed, hardly accurate, seeing that it has never been closed since the "great betrayal" of 1896, a betrayal laid, with all too great a measure of justice, to the charge of a French-Canadian and Catholic Premier; a betrayal, let it be added, said, with no little emphasis, by many of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's own people, to have been "avenged" on September 21 last. Here, again, the change of Premiership already referred to spells, or should spell, hope for Catholics; nor is the known piety of the new Prime Minister, his expressed resolve to do justice to all without weighty significance in this connection. Mr. Borden, to speak with all due respect and reserve, has the will and the power to set this question at rest, once for all, so far as any such settlement is possible, not by a fresh betrayal, but by the concession of those natural rights of which no man can deprive his neighbor with impunity.

"The American invasion" of the Prairie Provinces, as it has come to be designated, has a closer connection with the question of Catholic primary education than it might at first sight appear to have. When, therefore, a prominent Western Canadian, said to be in the Prime Minister's confidence, makes the control and supervision of immigration the thesis of a speech on "Canada and the Empire" before the Canadian Club, of Ottawa (November 25), this, again, is not without significance for Catholics generally. In no unneighborly spirit towards our friends to the south of us—it is, indeed, almost an insult to make such a protest—the gentleman referred to deprecates an indiscriminate or excessive American immigration into the newer west of Canada, as tending not only to a possible growth of an annexation movement, but also, which is far more serious and immediate import—whatever its political outcome—to "the triumph of mere materialism and of the Godless school." Let it be noted that the man who in a personal talk honored the present writer with the expression of the above conviction is an English-Canadian, and, I believe, a Methodist. He

will, I am sure, should he chance to read what is here written, acquit me of anything like a breach of confidence in here recording our conversation, in view of the supreme import of the issues involved.

To many Canadian Catholics, indeed, to those of French descent especially, the "American invasion" appears to present precisely the dangers here indicated, dangers which, they are convinced, would become intolerable realities should that invasion, by way of reciprocity, or of any other policy, ever lead to annexation. They are convinced, that is to say, that the "Americanizing" of the Canadian Northwest, that a policy of reciprocity does beyond doubt of question involve the ultimate political absorption of Canada in the United States. And, being so convinced, as they have a perfect right to be, holding, moreover, the other and infinitely more vital conviction that such absorption would be to the most serious detriment of the Church's interests, in the field of education especially, a breach of one of her innermost strongholds, is it any wonder that, East and West alike, they voted against a policy which seemed to threaten the dearest of all their interests—the faith of their little ones? Is it any wonder they should turn against an Administration which, as it must have appeared to them, was about to betray them again by setting their alleged material welfare above the real and eternal welfare of their souls and of the souls of their children?

Nor is this, as is so often asserted, the mere phantom of the Nationalist imagination, as is shown by the fact that a man not of their race or creed, who has spent the best years of his life in the Prairie Provinces, who went down to defeat in the last election because of his convictions, takes the same view of the matter. He may be said, indeed, to base his estimate of the true value of Canadian citizenship, his very imperialism, in the true sense of the word, upon this very fear of "materialism and the Godless school," points which he could not, of course, refer to, still less emphasize, in a public speech. And English Protestant as he is, he goes even farther in his desire that Canada should remain British; to the extent, it may be noted, of favoring a large French-Canadian immigration to the Prairie Provinces, not merely to offset "American" influences of the kind referred to, but chiefly in order that, by their loyalty to Christian and Catholic principles of primary education, they may counteract, if they cannot wholly banish, the evil influence of a system characterized by Manning as "heartless, headless and Godless." This, surely, is a Canadian nationalism, an imperialism with which no American Catholic can justly find fault.

The general policy of the new Administration, as foreshadowed in Mr. Borden's speech at Halifax, shortly after the election, appears to be one of closer imperial relations, while in no way lessening those which naturally bind Canada to the Great Republic to the south of her. It is a policy frequently spoken of and as frequently misspoken of as imperialism, but if the Canadian Club speech above alluded to may be taken as in any sense an interpretation of the Premier's policy in this respect, Americans, as has been shown, have no occasion to quarrel with it. The details must, of course, be left to Providence and to time; but the Dominion, having chosen a path other than that which Mr. Taft was so anxious she should walk in, appears, even humanly speaking, if I have faithfully chronicled events and inferences, to have selected an efficient guide and leader, as far above the suspicion of bias or partiality, national or religious, as it is possible for the leader of a political party to be. This imperial policy, moreover, while it does not directly, perhaps not even remotely, affect the interests of the Church in Canada, is none the less her concern, as the mistress and divinely commissioned teacher of loyalty to constituted authority, "whether to the King as supreme, or unto Governors," Presidents or Premiers.

Mr. Borden is also credited with favoring a policy of national ownership or control of public utilities. Here, again, time will show the wisdom or the possibility of its accomplishment; it has, of course, an interest even more remote, so far as the Church is concerned, than his imperialism or his commercial policy. It is to matters which immediately concern the Church's welfare, in the domain of education especially, that attention has chiefly been paid in the foregoing pages. If, therefore, there is even the appearance of bias, in so much as a single word or sentence, it will, I trust, be set down to my inability—if I may venture so to speak of it and myself—to regard any question, social, national or political, otherwise than as it may or may not affect the supreme and most vital of all possible or conceivable interests—for a Catholic—the interests and welfare of God's Holy Catholic Church. That, I take it, is the true import of our Holy Father's motto: *In omnibus Glorificetur Deus*; and while the Catholic, like the Church to which he belongs, has in a very real sense and should have no party affiliations such as bind other men, he can and may most legitimately express his preference for the party or the policy which, he honestly believes, is most likely to advance the Church's best interests at any time or in any country.

It is in this sense, therefore, and under these convictions that I have, as I venture to hope, written what is here offered to the

kindly consideration of American Catholics. It is in this sense and under this conviction that holding, as I do, that the Laurier Government betrayed the cause of the Catholic schools in Manitoba in 1896; that a French and Catholic Premier had, in consequence of certain inter-provincial, inter-racial, political and religious conditions, become a hindrance to the Church's work in Canada, I am honestly persuaded that the election of September 21, 1911, was but another evidence to princes, politicians and to peoples that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men." I am persuaded, further, that the Laurier Government, having misused its power and its opportunities, was deprived of both by God's Providence; that the kingdom has been given, by God's Providence, into other hands, has been entrusted to men who, there is every reason and hope to believe, will prove worthy of it.

O. S. B.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH PROTESTANTISM.¹

SOMERSET and his colleagues were bent on creating a new "Parliament-made Religion." Lollardism was at last to be legalized and every effort to be made to get rid of the last vestige of pretense that there was anything spiritual in the composition or constitution of the Reformed Church of England. This revolution could not be achieved in a day, but as little time as possible was to be lost in bringing it to a conclusion. Accordingly, on the 13th of November, 1547, a bill was introduced to enable "the admission of Bishops by the King's Majesty only." This measure was committed to Cranmer, as Archbishop of Canterbury, for revision, and having been dealt with by him, was read a second time on the 16th, when it was submitted to a more formal committee, composed of Bishops Tunstall² and Thirlby, the Lord

¹ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," by James Gairdner, LL. D., Vol. III. London, Macmillan & Co., Limited.

² Cuthbert Tunstall, born at Hackforth, in Yorkshire, in 1474, and brother of Sir Brian Tunstall, who fell at Flodden. The Christian name of the latter indicates a strain of Irish ancestry. He was educated at Oxford, Cambridge and Padua. After holding a number of other important offices, he became Bishop of London in 1522 and Bishop of Durham in 1530. He was a man of much ability and of great courtliness of demeanor, which recommended him for repeated employment as an ambassador to foreign sovereigns. In 1516 he was sent on an embassy to Charles V. at Brussels, where he formed an intimate friendship with Erasmus. In 1527 he was Wolsey's companion in the Cardinal's famous and magnificent embassy to France. Unfortunately, like Gardiner, he accepted the royal supremacy and rejected Papal authority, but also, like that prelate, refused to accept

Chief Baron and the King's Attorney General. It was read a third time on the 28th of November. On the 3d of December another measure was brought forward for regulating the election of Bishops, but although it received a second reading on the 5th, was eventually dropped in favor of one legalizing the making of Bishops by royal letters patent, without the issuing of any "congé d'élire," or leave to elect. This might still be issued, but would only be when it was quite certain that it would be regarded as a mere formality, as at present. This "congé d'élire" is now regularly granted to the cathedral chapters of vacant sees, after the Prime Minister has selected a new prelate and the sovereign has actually appointed him. The so-called "election" consists merely of a registration of the royal decree of appointment. The selection of the Bishop is generally the result of judicious party or political wire-pulling in either ministerial or court circles; sometimes partly in both. At the time, however, when this system was devised, Somerset and his fellow-conspirators were gravely concerned as to what might happen to it and other portions of their legislation if Edward VI. should reach the age of twenty-four years, when, under the provisions of the Act 28, Henry VIII., cap. 17, which his masterful father had caused to be passed, he would be entitled to repeal any or all of the Acts of Parliament passed during his minority by issuing letters patent to that effect. So long as this law remained on the Statute Book there would always be inducement offered to faithful Catholics to hope and strive, at a future date, for the annulment of their impious laws, with perhaps serious consequences for themselves. Unfortunately, however, they experienced less difficulty than they expected in getting Parliament to repeal Henry's law. It was got rid of speedily enough.

The next step accomplished was the enactment of a lengthy statute, strongly opposed in both Houses, directed to securing the complete confiscation of all endowments conferred by the pious dead of the past on chantries, brotherhoods and colleges for the maintenance of priests to say Masses for the souls of the testators or for those of their relatives or other beneficiaries. Professor Gairdner leaves his readers under no mistaken impression as to the real purposes of this statute, regarding which grossly false

the further innovations introduced in the reign of Edward VI. In 1552 he was deprived of his see, but was restored thereto on the accession of Mary, and it is recorded of him that under his rule not a single heretic suffered capital punishment. On the accession of Elizabeth he refused to recommit his old fault, and accordingly rejected the oath of supremacy. He was again deprived on the 29th September, 1559, and about six weeks afterwards died at the house of Archbishop Parker, who, although a pervert, seems to have remained a friend of his.

pretenses were resorted to. He says: "These foundations had already been dissolved by an Act of the last Parliament of Henry VIII.; but that Act had only taken partial effect, and a more thorough measure was required for the relief of an embarrassed treasury. The pretense, indeed, was to divert funds from superstitious uses and apply them to the erection of grammar schools, augmentation of the universities and relief of the poor. But the 'Acts of the Privy Council' speak without disguise as to the real object. For on the 17th of April, 1548, four months after this Act was passed, commissions were issued under it for the sale of chantry lands, the minutes of Council declaring that they were granted 'specially for the relief of the King's Majesty's charges and expenses, which do daily grow and increase by reason of divers and sundry fortifications, garrisons, levying of men and soldiers,' etc. And it is further stated that 'the King's most loving subjects were induced the rather and franklier to grant those said colleges and free chapels, chantries and other things . . . that they might thereby be relieved of the continual charge of taxes, contributions, loans and subsidies.' This is extremely candid as explaining the influences which carried the Act through Parliament. But the motive expressed in the preamble to the Act itself was 'considering that a great part of superstition and errors in Christian religion has been brought into the minds and estimations of men by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ, and by devising and phantasing vain opinions of Purgatory and Masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed,' etc. Thus Parliament, inspired by such motives as the Council so frankly declared afterwards, invoked theology in aid of the Act of Confiscation."³ This theology, be it noted, was utterly erroneous even so far as the Church then still existing was concerned, for its ministers were at the time yet offering the "Masses satisfactory" for the repose of the soul of Henry VIII., for which he had left bequests. Somerset, therefore, induced Parliament, in this measure, to make a pronouncement in favor of a change in the national religion which it seems reasonable to assume the late King never would have sanctioned. The Act was not passed without encountering much opposition. Even Cranmer opposed it—not because he desired to preserve the Mass, but because he wanted to have the endowments applied to educational purposes or the relief of the poorer clergy.

Matters generally were, however, moving rapidly towards the "Reformation" of religion, and on the 17th of December the wretched Convocation passed a resolution demanding the repeal

³ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., p. 56.

of all laws and canons prohibitory of the marriage of the clergy. This resolution was not passed without much opposition and was only carried by the pressure exercised by Somerset, who was influenced by Cranmer. Mr. Gairdner frankly says that "it is to be feared that contemporaries did not look upon it so much in the light of a reform as of a kind of legitimizing of women hitherto in an ambiguous position. Indeed, the prejudice against them remained long after. Queen Elizabeth's objection to a married clergy is well known; and it must be said that there were clerical and even episcopal wives in her time whose characters were painfully notorious."⁴ Convocation having thus done its part of the evil work, there was comparatively little difficulty in inducing Parliament in the following year to accept a Bill providing "that lay and married men may be priests and have benefices." Those who would argue in favor of the "continuity" theory and the validity of Anglican Orders conveniently ignore this statute. Parliament was prorogued on Christmas Eve, and Somerset and Cranmer had an interval wherein to legislate, as they were fond of doing, by Proclamation. These worthies were mightily concerned for the preservation of respect for the Blessed Sacrament. One of the first of their edicts was issued on the 27th of December. It purported to explain the Sacrament in a fashion different from that laid down in the existing Act of Parliament. Mr. Gairdner writes: "The King, it was said, had made a good and godly Act against contemners of the Sacrament; yet some of his subjects, as he was informed, 'not contented with such words and terms as Scripture doth declare thereof, nor with that doctrine which the Holy Ghost by the Evangelists of St. Paul had taught us,' still raised 'contentions and superfluous questions' about it, entering rashly into high mysteries in their sermons and conversation with irreverent inquiries whether the body and blood of Christ was there, 'really or figuratively, locally or circumscriptly, and having quantity and greatness, or but substantially and by substance only, or else but in a figure and manner of speaking; whether His blessed body be there, head, legs, arms, toes and nails, or any other ways, shape or manner, naked or clothed; whether He is broken or chewed, or He is always whole; whether the bread there remaineth as we see, or how it departeth; whether the flesh be there alone, and the blood, or part, or each in other, or in the one both, in the other but only blood. And what blood? That only which did flow out of the side, or that which remained? With other such irreverent, superfluous and curious questions,' aiming at things 'to which our human imbecility cannot attain.' The King,

⁴ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., p. 58.

therefore, by advice of the Protector and Council, commanded that no one should henceforth openly argue on such questions, 'affirming any more terms of the said blessed Sacrament than be expressly taught in the Holy Scripture and mentioned in the fore-said Act, nor deny none that be therein contained and mentioned until such time as the King's Majesty, by the advice of His Highness' Council and the clergy of this realm, shall define, declare and set forth an open doctrine thereof, and what terms and words may justly be spoken thereby, other than be expressly in the Scripture contained in the Act before rehearsed.' Meanwhile good subjects were to 'devoutly and reverently affirm and take that holy bread to be Christ's body and that cup to be the cup of His holy blood, according to the purport and effect of the Holy Scripture contained in the Act before expressed.' Yet the King did not wish to discourage those ignorant and willing to learn from inquiring further on the subject from those whom he considered qualified to teach. But contentious debaters, who called the Sacrament an idol, or by any such vile name, would incur the King's indignation and suffer imprisonment."⁵ Meantime the royal visitors, among whom was Ridley,⁶ in London and throughout the provinces were vigorously engaged in pulling down the crucifixes and images of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, these being generally "given to the boys to be broken." The Church was being "reformed" with a vengeance!

On the 27th of January, 1548, Cranmer informed Bishop Bonner that "my Lord Protector's Grace, with the advice of the King's Majesty's Council, for certain considerations them thereunto mov-

⁵ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., pp. 59, 60.

⁶ Nicholas Ridley, born about 1500, in Northumberland. He received his first education at a grammar school in Newcastle-on-Tyne, when he proceeded to Cambridge, becoming fellow and master of that university. Here he became tainted with the heretical doctrines which had already been preached at Cambridge by Tyndale and Bilney, whose theories had also corrupted Cranmer and Latimer. Proceeding to the continent, Ridley became still more imbued with unorthodox principles, and on his return to England became a useful tool of the conspirators who were resolved on subverting the ancient faith. He became domestic chaplain to Cranmer, in his office as Archbishop of Canterbury, and was soon made Bishop of Rochester. When Bonner was deprived of the See of London, in 1550, Ridley succeeded him, and thenceforth was an active supporter of the new religion. In 1552 he visited the Princess Mary at Hunsdon, and sought to browbeat her into abandoning Catholicity. He, however, received quite as much as he gave, and had to retire discomfited. On the death of Edward VI. he declared for Lady Jane Grey, and at St. Paul's Cross proclaimed both Mary and Elizabeth to be illegitimate. As soon, however, as Mary was proclaimed Queen he hastened to court at Framlingham, but naturally he was received with scant courtesy, his treason being known to all men. He was speedily arrested and sent to the Tower. Eventually, with Latimer, he was burned to death at Oxford, on the 16th October, 1555.

ing," had resolved that no candles should be borne on Candlemas Day, nor ashes nor palms used henceforth any longer. And this he was to cause to be notified in all parish churches, and to other Bishops that they might do the like; so that the change might be complete by Ash Wednesday. On the 21st of February a mandate was issued by Somerset to the Bishops as a whole requiring the removal from all the churches of every image whatsoever; not one was to be spared, however venerable or revered. "Next came out, on the 8th of March, 'an Order of Communion' prefaced by a royal proclamation to give it validity. This was natural, as Communion in both kinds had been agreed to both by Convocation and Parliament; and it was, of course, right to have the form authorized and ready for use before Easter Sunday, which was the 1st of April. The new ritual was contained in a pamphlet of ten leaves; and it really was hardly so much a change as an addition to the existing service. The Latin Mass was to go on as before, without any variation except that when the laity were to communicate, the celebrant was not to drink up all the wine he consecrated, and the 'Order' was simply an English form for administering to them after the priest's Mass. It contained, however, some prefatory exhortations and a general confession to be used by the congregation to obviate the necessity of private confession and shrift for those who preferred to do without them."⁷ Gardiner and his time-serving colleagues, who had sought to save the Sacraments of the Church by betraying the Papacy, had indeed bitter reason to rue the folly of their opportunism. As for him, he was brought, on the 8th of January, out of the Fleet Prison into the presence of the Lord Protector and Council, when he was informed that his previous offenses were remitted by the General Pardon, or amnesty, which had lately been voted by Parliament. Having been soundly rated for his past contumacy and told that he was now released from captivity, he was asked if he would conform now to the injunctions and homilies, "and such other doctrine as should be set forth from time to time by the King's Highness and clergy of this realm, articles of part whereof, touching Justification, were then exhibited to him to declare in the same his opinion." These are the words in which the story can still be read in the records of the Privy Council. Thus cornered, Gardiner declared that he would act in accordance with the other Bishops, but that, as regards the particular article upon which he was specially challenged, he should like to have four or five days within which to consider his answer. This was granted, but when he came to make reply it fell short of what the Council wanted, and

⁷ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III, p. 62.

he was ordered to remain within his own house. In a little time he was notified that he might return to his diocese, but it was not long before complaint was made in London that he was not nearly as zealous therein for the new order of things as he should be. Whereupon he was brought back to the metropolis and ordered to preach before the King, in order to make his position clear. This he did, but while doing his best to avoid offense, he made it plain that he had no intention of abandoning any of the sacramental doctrines of the Catholic Church. He was promptly re-arrested and confined in the Tower, where he remained until released on the accession of Queen Mary.

Professor Gairdner devotes a great deal of space to critical analysis of Cranmer's mind on the questions of Transubstantiation and of the Real Presence in the Most Holy Sacrament. When all has been said that can be said, the outstanding fact remaining is that, so long as Henry VIII. was alive the Archbishop of Canterbury, no matter what his personal belief really was, did not dare to admit that he rejected the teaching of the Church. If he had, Henry would have dealt with him precisely as with Anne Askew, Lambert and several others whom he promptly consigned to the stake for their heretical opinions on the subject. Mr. Gairdner points out that he had abundant grounds for prudence: "To deny Transubstantiation was death under the Six Articles; and in the Book of 1543 the doctrine was very expressly laid down by the King's authority. How the Primate of All England could have retained his own Lutheran theology after these dates may very well seem astonishing. In point of fact, he apparently did not, but this does not make his position less extraordinary; for, from what we hear, he does not seem to have kept up even to the Lutheran standard."⁸ So far back as 1543 he had shocked his own prebendaries by a lecture on the Sacrament of the Altar, in which he described It as "but a similitude." His opinions were, therefore, pretty well known, but he never opened his lips or lifted a hand in defense of those whom Henry burned for holding similar views. He maintained an attitude of nearly complete reticence on the question for close on two years after Henry's death. "Under Edward VI., when the Act of the Six Articles was repealed, he was for some time still held to be a Lutheran, and disappointed the expectation of the more ardent Reformers in England by his reticence on this great subject. But he was moving cautiously and preparing to avow a change of opinion which, as we learn from himself, was the result of conferences with his chaplain Ridley, the future Bishop. At a time which, as it has been shown with

⁸ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., pp. 75, 76.

almost definite certitude, must lie between the narrow limits of the end of December, 1547, and the beginning of February, 1548, he submitted three sets of questions concerning the Mass to the Bishops of both provinces (or the greater number of them), and to at least two divines besides, whose answers enabled him to see the amount of sympathy that he might expect in the policy which he had now in view, of changing the Mass into a Communion service. Reception by the laity in both kinds had already been authorized, and 'the Order of Communion' came out on the 8th of March, 1548."⁹ On the 14th of December, 1547, in a debate in the House of Lords he publicly proclaimed his rejection of the Catholic belief in Transubstantiation and the Real Presence. His action was supported by Ridley, now King's Bishop of Rochester, who, according to the testimony of a heretical observer, Traheron, "handled the subject with so much eloquence, perspicuity, erudition and power as to stop the mouth of that most zealous Papist, the Bishop of Worcester—Heath." Traheron adds: "The foolish Bishops have made a marvelous recantation." With reference to all this, Dr. Gairdner says: "That Cranmer's declaration in the end of the year 1548 really tended to silence discord among Bishops and clergymen may be true. It was unquestionably favorable to the noisy party, and the opposite school were bound to show some respect for an Archbishop, however much they differed from him. But it was certainly high time to do something, not only to remedy disorder, but, if possible, to get rid of its causes. In a contemporary chronicle we read as follows:

"At this time was much preaching through all England against the Sacrament of the Altar, save only Mr. Laygton, and he preached, in every place that he preached, against them all. And so was much controversy and much business in Paul's every Sunday, and fighting in the church, and of none that were honest persons, but boys and persons of little reputation; and would have made much more if there had not a way been taken. And at the last, the 28th day of September following, there was a proclamation that none of both parties should preach unto such time as the Council had determined such things as they were in hand withal; for at that time divers of the Bishops sat at Chertsey Abbey for divers matters of the King and the Council.'"¹⁰

Parliament was twice prorogued in 1548, after two brief sittings, held merely in order to vote supplies, but was called together again on the 24th of November of that year.

The sitting was destined to be a momentous one. The Bishops

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 77.

¹⁰ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., p. 80.

and other divines who had been meeting, deliberating and disputing, first at Chertsey and secondly at Windsor, relative to the production of a new manual of public worship had—by a majority—compiled a Prayer Book satisfactory to Somerset, to Cranmer and Edward VI. This was laid before the House of Lords on the 14th of December, 1548. It created sharp conflict, as well it might. "Bishop Tunstall objected that 'the adoration was left out of the book.' Those who drew it up, he said, considered that there was nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine. His speech drew forth comments from Cranmer and from Heath, of Worcester; and at the end of the day Bishop Thirlby made a rather disconcerting remark that the book, as touching the doctrine of the Supper, was not agreed upon among the Bishops, but was only in disputation. The Protector next day endeavored to make out that the doctrine had been settled by a majority of votes; but Thirlby replied that things were not agreed upon till they were conceded. It was a duty to set forth God's truth in plain terms, and as this had not been done he could not agree to the doctrine. The Protector was seriously put out, and said Thirlby's words implied wilfulness and obstinacy. But Bonner brought a far more serious battery to bear. The doctrine of the proposed Prayer Book, he said, was not decent, because it had been condemned as heresy, not only abroad, but in England also, in the case of Lambert; and, proceeding further to show how the book countenanced heresy, he provoked Somerset more than ever. But it is needless to go into the whole controversy. The discussion lasted five days, and was closed by Cranmer on Wednesday, 19th of December, when the book was sent down to the Commons, who at once returned it. The bill to authorize the new Prayer Book passed finally through the Lords in January, 1549, when ten Bishops voted for it and eight against. In the Commons it passed its third reading on the 21st, and it was to become operative from Whitsunday following. The measure thus became law, and is commonly known as the First Act of Uniformity."¹¹ Meantime the general concerns of the country were in a parlous state. On the 17th of March, 1549, Somerset was successful in securing the execution for high treason of his more able, but equally unscrupulous brother Thomas, Lord Seymour, Lord High Admiral of England, husband of the Queen Dowager, Catherine, and guilty lover of the Princess Elizabeth, afterwards the "Virgin Queen." Seymour, however, was not executed for his immoralities, of which the Reformers thought little, but because Somerset and Cranmer believed that he was conspiring against them, seeking to release the King from their

¹¹ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," Vol. III., pp. 83, 84.

control and tutelage, in order to place him within his own.¹² A tremendous war was being waged with Scotland, mainly with a view to securing the hand of its young Queen, Mary, for Edward and, of course, her eventual Protestantizing. All interest in this costly conflict ended when Mary was enabled to escape to France and was married to the Dauphin. Terrible distress existed amongst the people, agriculture was at the lowest ebb, the currency was depressed and the general condition of the masses deplorable in the last degree. On top of these calamities came risings in several of the principal counties of the kingdom, which were only suppressed by the employment of large bodies of foreign troops, mercenaries imported from Italy, Spain and Germany, for the purposes of the war against Scotland. Order was temporarily restored by dint of many atrocities, but a still more serious insurrection, mainly produced by the religious changes, under the leadership, in Devonshire, of Humphrey Arundel, and, in Norfolk, of Ket the tanner,¹³ soon occupied the attention of the Government and all the available forces of the town for a long time. Peace was restored at last, but Somerset's prestige had vanished and the hour of his downfall was at hand. Before and throughout the disturbances the Princess Mary was fighting a splendid battle in defense of her own liberty of conscience and against the religious innovations, so far as a poor lone woman, virtually in captivity, could.

Describing what occurred, Professor Gairdner says: "Before these disturbances the forward policy in religion had met with a serious obstacle in one important quarter. The Princess, or, as she was officially called, the Lady Mary, continued her Mass and ignored the new Prayer Book and Order of Communion altogether. It was difficult to pass this over, as it would naturally encourage others. On Sunday, the 16th of June, 1549, as appears by the Acts of the Privy Council, the Lords wrote to her, 'giving to her advice to be conformable and obedient to the observation of His Majesty's laws, to give order that the Mass should be no more used in her house, that she would embrace and cause to be celebrate in her said house the Communion and other divine services set forth by His Majesty, and that Her Grace would send to the said Lord Protector and Council her Comptroller and Dr.

¹² Lingard's "History of England," edition of 1825, Vol. VII., p. 43, et supra.

¹³ Robert Ket, a tanner of Wymondham, who raised the standard of rebellion, as stated above. He was a wealthy landowner as well as tanner. Sixteen thousand men assembled at his call in the vicinity of Norwich, which he captured twice, holding it after the second occupation until it was finally recovered for the king by the Earl of Warwick. In a battle which ensued Ket's forces were finally routed and he was taken prisoner. Eventually he was hanged in Norwich.

Hopton, her chaplain, by whom Her Grace should be advertised from their Lordships more amply of their minds, to both her contentation and honor.' Mary was at this time at Kenninghall, in Norfolk, from which place she answered them six days later." In this reply she positively refused to make any alteration in her devotional exercises or to recognize any ritual other than that which existed at the time of her father's death and roundly censured all who had anything to do with the introduction of alterations during the minority of her brother, "to the displeasure of God and unquietedness of the realm." Moreover, she declined to send either her chaplain or Comptroller to London, on the ground that the first was ill and that she could not do without the services of the other in the management of her household and the administration of her finances. The letter was a dignified one and made plain that the courageous Princess was determined to uphold her royal prerogatives. The Privy Council, however, were determined not to be balked in their purpose, and accordingly issued personal summonses to the chaplain, the Comptroller and another of her suite, a Mr. Englefield, to attend before them. These officials could not, of course, plead any privilege, and Mary, in order to save them from the peril of disobedience, ordered them to comply with the mandates served on them. It appears that the Comptroller was almost immediately allowed to return to Norfolk, but the chaplain, Dr. Hopton, was detained from the 27th of June to the 7th of July (1549), when he was sent back with a number of memoranda denying the correctness of many statements in Mary's letter. For instance, in this she had boldly and rightly asserted that "the law made by Parliament is not worthy the name of law," meaning thereby the statute substituting a Communion service for the Mass. It was pointed out that no subject had a right to question the validity of a law approved by the King and enacted after "long study, free disputation and by the uniform determination of the whole clergy consulted, debated and concluded," while no person had less right to deny its authority than the King's sister, who was in special degree bound to respect the royal authority.

Referring to this pettifogging point, Professor Gairdner quite rightly says: "Of course, the contention of the Council was indisputable, that one law can repeal another law; but still the question of authority remained. That statute law could regulate religion at all was an idea which had never been entertained before the preceding reign; yet, if it could at other times, it was felt that, during a minority at least, so high a matter ought not to be further disturbed. For when special precautions had been taken to guard against serious innovations even by Parliament, till the

King should be fully twenty-four years old, how could he be thought competent now in his twelfth year to discharge adequately the extraordinary functions of a 'Supreme Head' of the Church of England? If anything in Mary's letter was really open to question, it was the assertion that her father's laws were agreed to 'without compulsion by the whole realm.' That was certainly not the case, but it was a statement which it hardly became the Council to challenge." Of course, the only fragment of basis for the Council's argument was provided by Henry's statute of the Six Articles, which profanely accorded to the Sacraments of God's Church the sanction and protection of the same Parliament which had rejected the jurisdiction of the Holy See and proclaimed the King its head. Mary's defense of her position was undoubtedly impaired, viewed from a Catholic aspect, by her reliance on that measure, instead of solely on the ancient practices, principles and laws of the Church; but she wanted to make the other point that Somerset and his colleagues had solemnly sworn to maintain the statute, which they had since torn into shreds. She was, however, fighting a splendid battle with comparatively little help. Even while she fought she knew that her life, so to say, hung upon a hair. She was contending with men who would not have hesitated to consign her to the darkest dungeon in the Tower, to death upon the scaffold, by the dagger or by poison. Her strong faith and inherited Tudor courage sustained her in a terrible conflict.

Only a brave heart—one devoid of fear—could have enabled her to face her persecutors, to answer their upbraidings as she did, not them, and to censure their proceedings as if she had cohorts note them and to censure their proceedings as if she had cohorts of soldiers to enforce her will. On the 2d of July she wrote, in part, to the Council as follows:

"It is no small grief to me to perceive that they whom the King's Majesty, my father (whose soul God pardon), made in this world of nothing in respect of that they be come to now, and at his last end put in trust to see his will performed, whereunto they were all sworn upon a book—it grieveth me, I say, for the love I bear to them, to see both how they break his will and what usurped power they take upon them in making (as they call it) laws, both clean contrary to his proceedings and will, and also against the custom of all Christendom and (in my conscience) against the law of God and His Church, which passeth all the rest. But though you among you have forgotten the King, my father, yet both God's commandment and nature will not suffer me to do so. Wherefore, with God's help, I will remain an obedient child to his laws as he left them, till such time as the King's Majesty, my brother, shall

have perfect years of discretion to order the power that God hath sent him, and to be a judge in these matters himself; and I doubt not but he shall then accept my so doing better than theirs which have taken a piece of his power upon them in his minority.

"I do not a little marvel that you can find fault with me for observing of that law which was allowed by him that was a King, not only of power, but also of knowledge how to order his power—to which law all you consented, and seemed at that time, to the outward appearance, very well to like the same—and that you could find no fault all this while with some amongst yourselves for running half a year before that which you now call a law—yea, and before the Bishops came together; wherein, methinketh, you do me very much wrong if I should not have as much preëminence to continue in keeping a full authorized law made without partiality, as they had both to break the law which at that time, yourselves must needs confess, was of full power and strength, and to use alterations of their own invention."

There is no doubt that the boldness of Mary's attitude actually frightened the Protector and the Council. They realized the danger of pushing matters to extremes with the heroic and strong-willed Princess. In his reply the Protector made statements regarding Henry VIII. which—if well founded—are sufficient to seriously discredit the sincerity of his Catholic declarations in the famous will. Somerset wrote to Mary: "Did not His Grace also depart from this life before he had finished such godly orders as he minded to have established to all his people if death hath not prevented him? Is it not most true that no kind of religion was permitted at his death, but left all uncertain, most like to have brought us in parties and divisions if God had not helped us? And doth your Grace think it convenient it should so remain? God forbid! What regret and sorrow our late master had the time he saw he must depart, for that he knew the religion was not established as he purposed to have done, I and others can be witness and testify." The Princess, however, held on steadfastly to her determination to retain the ancient devotions and practices of the Church and, through sheer fear of another popular uprising if she were coerced, a Royal dispensation was issued relieving her for the time from obligation to obey the new religious ordinances.

All this time Gardiner was in prison, and even Bonner¹⁴ was

¹⁴ Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, was born about 1500. He gained a high reputation by his knowledge of canon law while still a student at Oxford, and as soon as ordained was singled out by Wolsey, who made him one of his chaplains for promotion, and also bestowed on him several benefices. After Wolsey's fall Bonner distinguished himself by his support of Henry VIII., and even argued his cause with such vehemence before

there also. As Professor Gairdner remarks: "His submission to the royal visitation had been somewhat forced; but, apparently, it had been perfectly loyal, and he had even complied with orders affecting ritual which could scarcely have agreed with his own judgment. Nevertheless, the Council addressed to him a letter on the 2d of August, telling him that through his evil example and his slackness in preaching and instructing the people, they absented themselves from prayer and the Holy Communion. They frequented foreign rites and Masses such as were not allowed by the orders of the realm. Moreover, adultery and fornication abounded. The Bishop had been admonished of these things, but had made no redress. They therefore peremptorily commanded him to reform that neglect; and they also required him to preach a sermon at St. Paul's against the sin of rebellion, the heads of which sermon they prescribed for him, adding some further directions in consequence of the defeat of the rebels. He accordingly preached at Paul's Cross on the 1st of September, and apparently meant to do this duty, even as regards the Government. He did declare in his sermon the unlawfulness of rebellion, but he was no less anxious to set forth that old sacramental doctrine in which he still believed, and which he felt was now being imperiled by irreverence and fanaticism. He perhaps did not like to be dictated to as to the exact line that he should take, but he honestly tried to do all that he was asked to do, especially in declaring the sinfulness of rebellion."¹⁵ Unfortunately for himself, he omitted to lay stress on one of the articles, to the effect that the King possessed as full authority in matters of religion while still a minor as if he had attained his majority. This was regarded as evidencing treasonable intention, and he was committed to the Marshalsea.

the Pope at Marseilles that, it is alleged, he deemed it prudent to fly secretly from that city. In 1540 he was made Bishop of London, and assisted the King in securing the condemnation and execution of several Protestants, like Anne Askew, who denied the Real Presence of our Lord in the Most Holy Sacrament. Like Gardiner, he was opposed to the religious changes introduced during the minority of Edward VI., and was, as stated above, imprisoned and deprived of his see in 1550. On the accession of Mary, in 1553, he was restored to liberty and resumed possession of his see. He appears to have taken an active part in the harsh proceedings then instituted against those whose tendencies were revolutionary in the matter of religion. On the accession of Elizabeth, in 1558, he was, in consequence, marked out for the displeasure of that infamous woman, and when he came with the other Bishops to render homage she refused to allow him to kiss her hand. In May, 1559, he was summoned before the Privy Council to take the oath of supremacy, acknowledging the Queen as head of the Church. He nobly refused to do so, and Elizabeth deposed him from his episcopal chair and imprisoned him in the Marshalsea, where he died, after much suffering, in 1569.

¹⁵ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," p. 101.

Ere long he was followed to prison by Somerset himself. Dr. Gairdner tells the story of the latter's fall in the following words: "Although the Council had agreed from the very first that Somerset should be Protector, and had even put him over their own heads more unreservedly by the commission of the 12th of March, 1547, dislike of his ascendancy must certainly have been growing. Just before his Scottish campaign he obtained, under date of August 11, a commission as the King's Lieutenant and Captain General of wars both by land and sea; and, of course, his victory at Pinkie Cleuch in September covered him with glory. At the opening of Parliament in November following, a special place was assigned to him by writ of Privy Seal, where he should always sit apart, whether the King was present or not, and he was given all the privileges ever enjoyed by any previous Protector during a minority, notwithstanding a statute of 31 Hen. VIII. about the placing of the Lords in the Parliament Chamber. He was then at the height of his power. Yet at the end of that session on Christmas Eve, he was persuaded to surrender those two patents of March 12 and August 11 for a fuller grant from the Crown which was witnessed by the signatures, both of King Edward himself at the head, and of all the Lords present in Parliament that day. In this document he is appointed 'to be our chief and principal counsellor, and chiefest and highest of our Privy Council;' and, for the rest, it was almost in every point an ample confirmation of the contents of the two patents surrendered. But there was one important exception. The office of Protector was not to be held absolutely during the whole time of the minority, but was by this grant to be terminable at the King's pleasure. So a well-concerted cabal could easily unseat him at any time. Now the kingdom had been seriously weakened by the many rebellions in different places, and was further threatened by a foreign enemy. At the very time when the Norfolk rebellion was at its height the French had taken and fortified Sark, and the French King himself was in the field with an army which took several places near Boulogne, and seemed in a fair way to recover that much-prized conquest of Henry VIII. Then the Earl of Warwick, having subdued the Norfolk rebels, came up to London, where many of the Council, disaffected towards the Protector's government, had withdrawn from Court. He held a consultation with them at Ely Place, Holborn. They proclaimed Somerset a traitor on the 8th of October, and by the 14th had him separated from the King and lodged him in the Tower. Articles were drawn up accusing him of manifold offenses, which he confessed to save his life. The Protectorate was at an end, and a new government was to take

its place."¹⁶ At this point we may lay down Professor Gairdner's fascinating work, with the expression of the hope that its veteran and impartial author may be enabled to bring to full accomplishment the great service to the cause of historic truth he is endeavoring to render.

WILLIAM F. DENNEHY.

Dublin, Ireland.

RIGHT TO PROPERTY.

PRIVATE PROPERTY.

IF WE take a small tribe of about one thousand persons, living a life more or less nomadic, with little or nothing in the way of agriculture or of domesticated cattle, or of trade; but supported mostly by fishing, hunting and a spontaneously offered vegetation, then in such a people property, both common and private, to some extent would exist; yet in a very small degree, especially what was private. Among personal belongings would be a rude clothing, and perhaps some equally rude ornaments, for love of adornments seems aboriginal; a few tools and a few articles serving as toys or curiosities. But the property we here want to consider is that which involves a large and permanent ownership, such as exists in our complex civilization, as to which it is a conclusion firmly fixed for every well-examining mind that some things must be of public ownership as the possessions of the State, or of the municipality, or of the village Council, or of the patriarchal authority, while other things must be private either to families or to individuals. It is the private possession which we are going to examine.

Upon it we may premise these few remarks that its proportion to public property cannot be a fixed ratio, but will vary very much indeed with times and circumstances and the accidents of history; that no method will be free from the liability of very grave abuse, so long as mankind at large is so far from perfection as it has hitherto been; that absolute equality in possessions all round is a dream quite beyond realization, and in some respects beyond desirability, since such a dead level has no analogy in the effective conduct of human affairs.

The leading reasons for the admission of private property, held in stable possession, were mentioned by Aristotle, from whom St.

¹⁶ "Lollardy and the Reformation in England," p. 105.

Thomas has adopted them as valid. The Greek philosopher (Polit. II., 5), leaving out or combating Plato's reasons for a community of wives and property in the ruling class, argues that possessions held in common would lead to dissensions about produce or profit; that the stimulus and the sense of enjoyment in private property would be injuriously excluded; that the virtues of liberality and magnificence, with their several offshoots, would be lost from among human perfections. St. Thomas (2^{da}, 2^{dae} Q. 66 A. 2) gives three reasons for possessions in private: first, that the best work will be done when individuals labor for their own separate concerns, in which the interest will *de facto*, with allowance for exceptions, be the keenest.¹ J. S. Mill so far felt the force of this contention that he preferred stimulus to labor before reward to labor already done as a title for holding land. "Landed property," he maintained, "if legitimate, must rest on some other justification than the right of the laborer to what he has created by his labor. The land is not by man's creation, and for a person to appropriate to himself a mere gift of nature is *prima facie* an injustice. A better title is because the strongest interest which the community and the human race have in the land is that it should yield the largest amount of food and other useful or necessary things. So the better cultivation is the best reason that can be given." Mill ought to have admitted both grounds, stimulus and reward. The second motive assigned by St. Thomas is the avoidance of confusion and the securing of order, which reason is valid for division of property as it is for division of labor and of ranks. The third argument might have been merged in the second; it is that peace and contentment are more likely to follow from the proposed arrangement than from communism, though neither system will work without considerable friction. It is the convenience in argument of communism that because it has never been, as its opposite system has been, exclusively or predominantly tried, it has never, like its rival, been proved lamentably defective in certain points, and hence its advocates can prophesy that it is the cure for the worst evils. It is in the opposite condition to that of a Roman Emperor described by Tacitus as "pronounceable by all a capable ruler if he had not ruled." Some defenders are more temperate in their promises, because they are more alive to human limitations under all conditions; and these honest supporters are met by kindred spirits in the opposite camp, who admit the failures of individualism and the successes of social effort, so far as both sets of facts are true. Here at present it is our purpose to insist that individuality, espe-

¹ Many paid managers get an immense interest simply in making a big business or in skillfully conducting a large operation.

cially in so far as it is identical with personality, is a great factor in human progress. While other writers lay stress, and much stress on the view that personality is altruistic, going out to persons beyond self; let us not forget that it is also egoistic, giving a certain due preference to self without injury to others and without refusal of even non-obligatory acts of self-sacrifice (2^{da}, 2^{dae}, Q. 66, A. 2. Lugo: De Justit, et Jure Diss. I. n. 5 et. 6). A person is defined "a substance intelligent, complete in itself and *sui juris*," Hence individual man has a right to attach certain external objects to himself as his own and as amplifications of his own personality, while he is glad that others enjoy the same rights for the securing of which he is ready to lend them a helper's hand.²

The foregoing, which is the classical defense of private property, is seen by modest Socialists to carry weight. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, who tries to avoid extravagances, fully concedes that the man who owns no private property does not fully own himself; so much is he enslaved by casual employers or charitable relief officers. The same writer objects to private ownership in the special case of land, but not in case of houses, money and other belongings needful for the fuller life of humanity—all of which appropriations have to be derived to individual possessors from the common stock held by the community for general distribution.

Neither of the philosophers, Aristotle and St. Thomas, is in favor of fortune growing to be immense. The Greek had his own national horror of the unbounded, the immoderate, the excessive, the transgressive of the golden mean; and St. Thomas in giving rules for the guidance of princes tells them not to let self-pushing individuals add house to house and field to field till they dispossess all their neighbors. He adds that for the good life of the individual man two things are needful, the principal of which is a virtuous course of action, and the secondary, which is instrumental to the first, consists in a sufficiency of material. (De Regim. Princip. Lib. I. c. 15.) What the limits of this sufficiency is we may gather in part from the *Summa*, 1^a, 2^{dae}, Q. 105. A. ad 3: Also Aristotle tells us that among certain peoples the law prohibited the sale of possessions except to escape some clear damage. For if a free sale were allowed without restriction, it might happen that all property would be gathered into a few hands, so that the land would be depopulated.³ To-day transactions in business of all sorts are so immense that the

² A purely legal act or a State-made origin of property is defended by some, to the exclusion of the personal exigencies and of God's will and of all moral requirement.

³ The famous Seidachtheia, attributed to Solon, was a drastic relief bill for debtors out of the hands of money-grabbers.

policy of *laissez-faire* becomes in some measure a necessity; to some degree, but not unlimitedly, we have to let the maxim work that where everybody is allowed to do the very best he can, under the vigilance of the law, to promote his own interests, the interest of the community will at the same time, if not in the same proportion, be advanced. Experience teaches the failure of many law-devised restrictions, such as maximum rates of interest and maximum expenditures on luxuries. Attempts in these directions have been made, and the lesson has been one of great caution in the procedure, since what works well in one quarter works ill in another; or fails to work at all, and so renders law contemptible.

If now we raise the question whether private property follows simply from the law of nature, at once we find how difficult it is to give an exact meaning to the inquiry. Our lawyers say that things become connected with personal rights, not of themselves, but through certain "acts and events," and these are contingent factors, not *à priori* necessities. To exclude all empirical elements from the constituents of morality was on the part of Kant an extravagant flight of abstraction,⁴ for these must always have a place in a concrete claim of property. Nature writes no man's name on any of her articles. She spreads no table with cards on the plates settling where each one is to sit at the banquet of life. Hence something positive has always to enter into every actual determination of a law of nature.⁵ No wonder that the *jus gentium*, which was supposed to be the code of all peoples as distinct from their several peculiar codes (*jura civitatum*) was not described by all writers alike; some called it positive law, others inclined more to calling it natural. Suarez, discussing the point as one of terminology, chooses to take the *jus gentium* to be positive or to be outside the natural law as such. (De Leg. Lib. II., c. 17.) So inextricably is the positive bound up with the natural that in the Church's decrees upon property or upon interest care is needed to distinguish the variable arrangement from the invariable principle. Not every decree is applicable to every age.

From Suarez we will begin in citing the opinions of authors on

⁴ Alles was empirisch ist, ist der Lauterkeit der Sitten selbst höchst nachtheilig. (Grundlegen zur Metaphysik der Sitten 2. Abschau.) Kant glories in keeping the principle of morality wholly abstract and in having as against his opponents a nicht ganz für alle Abstraction verdorbenen Vernunft.

⁵ Communis omnium possessio dicitur de jure naturali: distinctio possessionum et servitus non sunt inductae a natura sed per hominum rationem ad utilitatem humanae vitae 1a, 2dae, Q. 94 a. ad 3. Responsio certa est divisionam rerum factam esse non jure naturali sed jure gentium. (Sylvius in 2dam 2dae, Q. 66, a. 2.)

the question whether property as a right is natural. All through, let us remember that every one will have to admit the intervention of determining "acts and events" from the contingent order. "Some maintain," says Suarez, "that prior to original sin men were under a commandment to hold all things in common, and that though with the fall this prohibition was removed, yet from the aspect of the earliest and best conditions, private property is contrary to *jus naturæ*." Suarez himself denies all proof of such a positive precept given in Paradise or such a natural law. "The division of goods," he very soberly contends, "is not against the natural law or the perceptive; the natural law is but negative, not ordering the division to take place.⁶ Community of goods was in the natural law only so far as this law made no divisions, but left it for men to make them." (De Leg. Lib. II., Cap. 14. nn. 10, 11.) His appeal is to St. Thomas, one of whose utterances is often quoted: "Community of goods is attributed to natural law, not because this dictates that all things are to be held in common and nothing in private; but because natural law makes no division of goods; for the partition follows from human agreement, which is a maker of positive law. Private property, therefore, is not simply by nature, but arises through a human invention" (2da, 2dae, Q. 66, A. 2ad 1). It is a convention, but not purely conventional convention. If this human arrangement is called a "contract" we must not take the term in so precise a sense⁷ as to lay it open to the objection raised by T. H. Green that contract presupposes a *meum* and a *tuum*, and so absolutely cannot give origin to those possessions distinguishable as mine and thine. The same question is discussed by a brother in religion to Suarez, namely, Lugo, in his *De Justitia et Jure*, Lib. I., at the opening of the Sixth Disputation, where we are told that private property not only exists as a fact, but is also a just and expedient arrangement for the reasons assigned by St. Thomas. With this much taken for granted, the inquiry is started as to right *quo jure*? It is replied by Lugo that usually not natural, but positive law, or the *jus gentium*, is asserted to be the ground of the valid claim; for whereas by natural origin all things were held in common, to prevent the inconveniences of this condition men devised a scheme for private ownership.⁸ Lugo then distinguishes *jus naturæ* in the wider acceptance by which

⁶ That is, not directly; indirectly there generally is a natural exigence for division to secure peace and prosperity and to escape chaos.

⁷ As often possession of political power is only in theory from contract, so often much possession of land, now justified at least by prescription, had no formal origin in any contract or other legal title.

⁸ The Romans needed a "*jus gentium*" to judge those within their jurisdiction who had not the privilege of the "*jus Quiritium*" or "*Romanorum*."

it signifies such orderliness as is found in mere animal communities, *quod omnibus animalibus commune est*, and in the narrowest and more usual meaning as limited to the dictates of reason properly so styled. On the latter interpretation Lugo calls the normal divisions of property under present circumstances a matter of natural law in conjunction with the super-addition of a positive enactment, such as natural law itself requires for the common good. Others refuse thus to let "present circumstances" count within the natural law as one of its determinants; the difference is a matter of words, at least between scholastic disputants with whom first principles are concordant. Keeping to his own wider extension of the terms, Lugo declares private property to be by natural law, yet so as to concede all that those substantially require who assert a positive determination over and above nature. The nature which Lugo means is that in the concrete of our developed societies, in which also the several forms of government are natural, though freely selected in details. Always certain "acts and events," variable in particulars, must enter in according to natural law to give it those determinations which the concrete embodiment demands. Such acts are "occupation," taking possession of something open to the procedure and setting up a visible sign of the intention permanently to keep what has been appropriated in a formal way. Given a thickly populated country, like England, the *res nullius* waiting to be appropriated hardly exists, and so our law hardly recognizes it, and in that sense is said to "abhor a vacuum." Still, fish to be caught on the seacoast may serve as an example. Where there is unoccupied land, a sign of possession-taking, which among savages may often be a taboo mark, is more reasonably the obvious cultivation of the soil, to which may be added its enclosure with a fence and later within title deeds.

As to the consent of neighbors that may be rendered either implicitly or explicitly: often the law of nature demands such acquiescence as needful for the common good. "Even wolves," says Huxley, "could not hunt in packs but for a real understanding that they are not to attack one another during the chase" (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 10). This is natural law in Ulpian's wide sense; the scholastic sense has been sufficiently illustrated from Suarez and Lugo.

Our English writers starting from Hobbes are apt not to keep well in view the two parts, that which nature settles in general and that which men settle in particular, according to the prescription of Nature. Hobbes at times pays deference to natural law, but often he speaks as though he had never acknowledged any such fundamental principle. Then he traces all rights to the contract

which sets up the government; and one might think that he acknowledges nothing deeper: "The nature of justice consisteth in the keeping of valid covenants, but the validity of the covenants begins not with the constitution of a civil power sufficient to compel men to keep them, and then it is that propriety begins." (Leviathan, Part II., ch. 15.) If these words are taken quite rigorously, the covenant to keep covenants is the foundation of all covenanted agreement, by reason of the physical force which it first brings to coerce the contracting parties and make them stand by their word; this is the starting point of obligation. Hobbes returns to the subject of property again in chapter 18: "There is annexed to the sovereignty the whole power of prescribing rules whereby every man may know what goods he may enjoy. For before the constitution of sovereignty all men had a right to all things, which necessarily caused war; and therefore this propriety, being necessary for peace, is the act of that power in order to the public peace." Locke, whom Ricardo has followed, rested property too much on the right derived from labor,⁹ and so would limit ownership in land to what the possessor could keep under his own cultivation. Hume was a utilitarian, and therein he had one element of truth, but not the whole. His declarations are that "public utility is the sole origin of justice;" that in a set of people wholly lawless, "justice being no longer of use to a man's own safety or to that of others, he must consult alone the dictates of self-preservation without any regard to others;" that justice would also be non-existent where "perfect moderation and humanity" rendered such a virtue needless; that "right to property rests on its being absolutely requisite to the well-being of mankind and the existence of society." (Essay on Justice *passim*.) Another of our British writers, Father Green, represents in this matter an intelligible adaptation of Hegelianism. He argues that "contract presupposes property. The right to the full life rests on the common will of the society; each member contributes to satisfy the others in seeking to satisfy himself, and each is aware that the others do so; whence there results a common interest in the free play of the powers of all." This fact that quest after self-satisfaction thus led to general satisfaction was put down by Adam Smith piously to "the invisible hand of Providence." ("Wealth of Nations," book III., chap. I.) "Property," continues Green, "is realized will, where will stands for constant principle operative in all men qualified for any form of society."¹⁰

⁹ Mill's complaint is that property is now distributed almost in inverse ratio to the claims of labor and abstinence.

¹⁰ Condensed from "Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation," nn. 212-218.

In this way man's property answers to the elemental law of self-conservation and self-betterment; for by property, man, as it were, enlarges his own organs or his own self; he is in a way one with his possessions. He satisfies what Bergson calls *l'élan de vie*—the outspring of life into larger and larger existence. Man must be a person of culture, for which property alone can furnish the leisure and the ample means. Man is very incomplete if he just lives from day to day, from hand to mouth, without any prospective wealth of which he feels secure. Each day spent in labor to secure a bare livelihood offers no career worthy of a full spirit; there is about it nothing of liberality, even though from another aspect we acknowledge a dignity which the Greeks contemptuously denied in the patient toil of the need-driven drudge who just supports self and family. Besides cultured individuals, a cultured class is needed, some of whom at least will not only adorn, but greatly help the nation. England owes much to this source, and she must take the use as a compensation for inevitable abuse of a propertied aristocracy.

Diverse as the several views above indicated may seem, there is something of an agreement among them that private property is "what fits nature," and so is right. Some share of it is so fitting as to be also necessary; other parts can claim to be no more than complementary. According to the degrees of necessity, nature is more or less urgent in her dictate that ownership should be established. But in every case "acts and events," as the lawyers say, must intervene to realize nature's demand. For instance, "copyright" in books, with which patent right may be compared, seems the requirement of nature except in some instances, where other provision is at hand; as when authors used to publish their books by patronage, and wealthy subscribers, from an interest in literature or to gain its advertising power in the world of fame, would in sufficient numbers combine to make the writer's venture remunerative in at least a fair degree. Nowadays patrons cannot usually be found in adequate supply to guarantee our teeming publications, and therefore natural justice seems to call for some sort of copyright.

Nevertheless, it does not surprise us to find many lawyers in England talking of the right as purely a creation of the legislature. The point was argued out at length in the case of *Jeffreys versus Boosey*, 1851. It is quite in accordance with the anti-metaphysical temperament of M. Arnold that he should have taken the side of a law-creation for the right, saying: "An author has no property in his productions, but, then, neither has he a natural right to anything whatsoever he may produce or

acquire."¹¹ This view is quite that of Bentham, who declares "natural rights" to be "simple nonsense," "rhetorical nonsense," "nonsense upon stilts." (Works. Vol. II., page 501.) For him property rests simply on utility, backed by positive law, "government creates rights," "property and law are born together." As to copyright, the truth seems to be that in a society like our own, where literary production is a need for the public good as we conceive it, those who work in this service, which in legal phrase presents "valuable considerations," ought to have a security that their labor will be fairly paid; and therefore nature calls upon positive legislation to make some suitable enactment in answer to this claim. Once more we find nature plus "acts and events" concurring to establish a title in justice.

There is always some limit making private property not absolute. The government as an act of jurisdiction at least, if not of reserved ownership, retains its eminent domain, which it can put into exercise when a great public need requires it; then generally there is a sort of enforced sale. Many private proprietors began to emerge at the break-up of the feudal system; at the restoration under Charles II. these secured for themselves too great an exemption from public burdens and from control upon their land; but at the revolution of 1688 that was rectified, at least in part. Thus their property was shown to be not quite absolute. Another test of the absolute lies in *uti et abuti*, upon which restrictions are sometimes properly placed, *abuti* meaning to use up or alienate. A limit to use is set by such maxims as this: *Sic utere jure tuo ut alienum non lædas: Jus est uti et abuti quatenus juris ratio patitur*. The *Code Civil* lays it down: *Le droit d'usage et de disposer des choses de la manière la plus absolue, pourvu que l'on n'en fasse pas un usage prohibé par les lois ou les règlements*.¹² Aristotle has puzzled commentators by saying that what the law does not command it forbids; at least it is clear that often what the law does not forbid it does not thereby approve. There are

¹¹ *Fortnightly Review*, 1880, p. 322.

¹² Grotius (*De Jure Belli et Pacis*, Lib. II., c. 2, n. 2, and c. 3, nn. 3 and 4) and Pufendorf (*Lib. IV.*, 3, 4, nn. 3 and 4) give on the whole a moderate account of property, if all their principles are taken into account. Montesquieu tends too much in the direction of pure legislation: "Liberty is the right to do what the law allows," *Lib. XI.*, ch. 3. "Property is what law guarantees," *XXVI.*, 15. "The State can limit fortunes to the needs of individuals," *VII.*, 1. The French "Declaration of Rights," 1789, asserted the right of property to be "sound and inviolable," with a claim to compensation if government took it over. Rousseau allowed a man as much property as he could use himself and yet so that "*L'état à l'égard de ses membres est maître de leurs biens, par le contrat social qui sert de base à tous les droits.*" (*Lib. III.*, ch. 9.) In the more extravagant work, "*Discours sur l'Inégalité*," Rousseau said more than he wanted to defend afterwards, and pleaded a want of previous seriousness.

many uses made of property having only legal toleration. Much the law has to leave unpunished, because its range is necessarily restricted. But moral law is wider, and according to it the individual, while acquiring private property, has to use it in society and ought to see that the employment of what he owns is such that his neighbors cannot reasonably condemn it as injurious to them, or as contrary to the purposes for which society sanctions private possessions. Once more we cannot defend an absolute right, abstracted from all control of circumstances. In a sense which stops short of pure positivism, there is an element of truth claimable for the declaration of Jevons, in his work on "The State in Relation to Labor:" "We should rid our minds of the idea that in such matters there are abstract rights;" that is, wholly abstract, **incomplete severance from facts of history.**

How stands Socialism to our whole system? Among the things which his Socialism is not, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald puts down the negation of private property. He contends that his grievance is the fewness of those who possess any private property now, when nine-tenths of the workers have to put up with a week's wages needed for a week's consumption, without a small margin over, sufficient to be saved up against seasons of unemployment. Thus they are left without liberty of action in their expenditure. "Socialism assumes that individuality requires private property through which to express itself. Man must control and own something; otherwise he does not control and own himself. And if Socialism is not a cut-and-dried set of dogmas to be placed in a system, like one of those puzzles made by cutting up a picture into many confusing fragments, but an idea which is to be realized by a continuation of experimental change, we may rest assured that none of the incidents which are to be met on the way will abolish private property. The ownership of things will always be a way of expressing personality."¹³ This passage shows not only how the more thoughtful Socialists set tried results above abstract theories, but also how they admit the use of a fund beyond the money needful for present-day expense, in order that by the surplus they may give to man that freedom of expansion which will make him more fully a man and a more or less cultured ornament of society. How many workmen will use the opportunity for culture if they get it experience has not yet tested, as it has not yet tested how many can by any workable scheme be brought to possess the margin of private property which will afford them leisure for the refinements of life. To further his ideal Mr. MacDonald would allow inheritances, but not in their present shape and magnitude.

¹³ "The Socialist Movement," p. 129.

On the contrary, he would make his new form of private property much more limited and would have it grow out of "the nationalization of industrial capital and land"—the very thing that is supposed to entail its abolition. Only certain kinds of property can, according to our author, be allowed by the nation to be taken into private possession; land cannot be so disposed of; all inductive argument, says Mr. MacDonald, is against such arrangement, "it being the experience of every people in the world, whether barbaric or civilized, that when land becomes subject to private proprietorship, poverty inevitably follows." (Page 132.) The rejoinder may be made that some extent of inevitable poverty seems to be the price which will always have to be paid for every highly productive civilization in a large nation. But, at any rate, one thought that is valuable in Mr. MacDonald's teaching is that he is not for rapid generalization in theory, nor for headlong applications in practice; he stands for a course of development guided by experience of the past, along with a prudent trust in the future, offering to workers in reward of their services the prospect of private possessions, which will enable them to have a higher life of culture. It is easy to condemn a present system which is producing many evils along with much good; the difficulty is to find the plan which will produce very much good and very few evils. Christianity makes of inevitable poverty a good, and even of voluntary poverty.

J. RICKABY, S. J.

Stonyhurst, England.

THE REVELATION OF THE MONK OF EVESHAM.

THE history of Pre-Dantean Revelations on Hell, Purgatory and Paradise has yet to be written. It is a vast subject, for when the genius of Dante shone like a sun upon the world it put out all the lesser Purgatorial fires kindled by the minor visionaries who lived before his day, and it is only modern scholarship, and in this country the labors of the Henry Bradshaw and the Early English Text Societies, and in Germany of individual archæologists like Herr Roth, who by reprints of early Revelations to monks and nuns have reminded us that such a literature existed. The general reading public, if it ever gives such topics a thought, is probably under the impression that Dante was the first person since St. John the Evangelist to whom such visions of the other world were ever granted; but that is far from being the case,

for in England alone Pre-Dantean Visions go back as far as the seventh century and even earlier; but there is no need to pursue the origin of such literature any further back, or we might find ourselves ultimately landed in the fifth book of Virgil.

To mention only a few of such Revelations, in Germany we have those of the great and famous Abbesses, St. Hildegarde and St. Elisabeth of Schönaue, who lived in the twelfth century; in France the Vision of Barontus, a monk in mid-France, which was recorded in the middle of the seventh century, and about the same period the Vision of St. Fursey, an Irishman and anchorite, contained in the original life of him written in France. In Ireland the literature of the Purgatory of St. Patrick is enormous, among others, the visit of King Owen to St. Patrick's Purgatory in 1153, has been reprinted recently, as has the Vision of Tundal, also Irish.

In England the germ of such Revelations would seem to be found in the Vision of Dricthelm or Drithelm, a Northumbrian, father of a family, who lived in the seventh century, and having apparently died, came to life again as his wife and children were standing weeping round his bed, to the terror of them all. He then told them that he had had a Vision of Purgatory, through which place he had been led by an angel, who explained all he saw to him, which Vision he afterwards wrote down and left to the world. When moved by all he had seen he abandoned wife and children and fled first to a monastery and then became an anchorite. This Vision is contained in Bede and in the Chronicle of Roger de Wendover.

In the ninth century this Vision-literature flourished greatly in England, and became very popular among monkish authors, but it was turned largely to political purposes. Later we have the Vision of Thurkell by Ralph de Coggleshall in 1206 and that of the monk of Eynsham, an abridgment of which is to be found in Matthew Paris and Roger de Wendover, and, lastly, the Revelation of the Monk of Evesham, with which we are here concerned. The similarity of the names Eynsham and Evesham has led to a good deal of confusion between these two last-named works, but they are not the same books or writers or places. Eynsham is in Oxfordshire, Evesham in Worcestershire. Mr. Ward in an article on Pre-Dantean literature¹ implies, though he does not say it, that the Revelation of the Monk of Evesham was founded upon the Vision of the Monk of Eynsham, but the intrinsic evidence of the former book does not seem to support this opinion.

The name of the Monk of Evesham to whom this Revelation was made is unknown, but we are able to give a few details of

¹ *British Archaeological Journal*, Vol. XXX.

the state of the Abbey of Evesham and of one or two of his contemporaries. It was a large Benedictine Abbey dedicated to Our Lady St. Mary and St. Egwin, the founder, a local saint. It is agreed by antiquaries that the Revelation was written at the date it professes to have been, namely, 1196; the abbey was then governed, or rather misgoverned, by Abbot Roger Norreys, who reigned from 1192 to 1213, when he was deposed. During his long period of office disputes between him and his monks and also between the monastery and the Bishop of Worcester occupied a great part of the time of the community, the Abbot and monks being apparently agreed only in opposing the Bishop, for though they quarreled with Abbot Norreys themselves, they were loyal to him in his contest with his superior. The champion of the monks in both these campaigns was one of their number, named Thomas de Marleberge, who was elected Prior during the reign of the successor of Roger Norreys, and eventually was himself chosen as Abbot. He was evidently a wise and learned man, who did excellent work for the monastery, for to him we partly owe the celebrated Evesham Book or "*Officium Ecclesiasticum Abbatum*."²

A few years before the Revelation of the Monk of Evesham was written, Pope Celestine III. issued a Bull in 1192 authorizing a Pontifical containing forms for Benediction, of vestments, etc., at Evesham Abbey, and this was probably the source from which rather later the above-mentioned Evesham Book or Pontifical was compiled by Thomas de Marleberge, the MS. of which is in the Bodleian Library. It is written in a rather large, clear hand. He

² This "*Officium Ecclesiasticum Abbatum secundum Usum Eveshamensis Monasterii*" has been reprinted by the Henry Bradshaw Society, with copious notes by the editor, the Rev. Henry Wilson. It is unique of its kind, and consists of a Benedictionarium and full rubrics for the use of the abbot in all the offices performed by him—the order for making catechumens, of making clerics, of professing novices, of making Brothers, the order for holy matrimony, for the burial of a monk, the visitation of a sick Brother, the installation of an abbot, the commendation of a soul, the order of Extreme Unction, various benedictions, the prayers used at Mass and the corresponding rubrics throughout the ecclesiastical year from the Purification to Easter. Directions are also given for the saying or singing of Matins, for the private Mass of the abbot, for his sitting in the cloister to hear the confessions of the Brothers, and especially of the novices, when it is his turn or when he wishes to do so; also for the holding of a chapter, and of the manner of conducting a solemn procession when ordered to take place on one of the seven great feasts celebrated at Evesham. These seven were Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, the Assumption of Our Lady, the Deposition and the Translation of St. Egwin and All Saints' Day. These were the only days on which the abbot wore all the episcopal vestments. See "*Officium Ecclesiasticum Abbatum secundum Usum Eveshamensis Monasterii*," Henry Bradshaw Society, London, 1893.

also succeeded in getting the constitutions of the abbey confirmed by Papal decree at the Lateran Council in 1215.³

This Pontifical contains the names of four local saints whose cultus was practiced at Evesham, and whose shrines were placed in chapels in the abbey dedicated to them. These were, first, St. Egwin, the founder of the abbey, who died in 717. He was Bishop of Worcester from 693 to 710. He had two feasts, that of his Deposition and death, which was kept on December 30, and that of his Translation, on September 10. Second, St. Odulf, who was a Canon of Utrecht and died in 865; third, St. Credan, who was the eighth Abbot of Evesham after St. Egwin, whose feast was celebrated on August 19, and lastly, St. Wulson or Wulstan, who was Bishop of Worcester in the eleventh century. He is often confused with a holy anchorite named Wulfsey or Wulsey,⁴ a contemporary of the Bishop's, who lived for over forty years as a recluse in Worcester Cathedral, in a cell with a squint from which he could see the high altar. He also lived for many years as an anchorite in a cave near Evesham. St. Wulstan at first refused from humility the See of Worcester, but Wulfsey reproved him for so doing, and he then accepted the bishopric and was honored as a saint after his death.

The Monk of Evesham was probably an Englishman, for he wrote in the English of his time; but the spelling and punctuation, which no doubt suffered at the hands of subsequent copyists, are so bad and some of the vocabulary is so archaic that in making quotations we shall be obliged to modernize it sufficiently to make it intelligible. He was a young man at the time he received the Revelation, which he either wrote or dictated to another person, in order to edify, instruct, warn and awe others, the laity perhaps more even than religious, with an account of the terrors of Purgatory and the joys of Paradise, through which he, like Dante after him, made the journey he describes. Like the great poet, he does not hesitate to record the justice meted out to kings and Bishops, prelates, abbots, priests, judges, laymen and laywomen, as well as to monks and nuns and all classes of society, though this English Dante is less personal than the great visionary.

In the Revelation of our monk those who were highest in ecclesiastical rank were punished most severely for their sins, or as he beautifully says, "they were grieved in a more special bitterness of pains above others." He had a great friend among the monks who was also one of his confessors, and to him and another monk

³ See Preface to "The Revelation of the Monk of Evesham" in Edward Acker's English Reprints.

⁴ See Noabre's "History of Worcester."

he told part of the things he had seen during his trance in which the Revelation was made to him. The eight first chapters contain a most graphic description of his illness which preceded his trance, and are apparently written by a third person; from the ninth chapter the Revelation is written in the first person.

He was grievously ill for fifteen months, and nothing the leech did seemed to help him, but rather to make him worse, at which we are not surprised, knowing the ignorance of the physicians of that day and their drastic methods of treatment. He was sometimes unable to take anything for the space of nine days but a little warm water; "during the last three months he was more diseased and enfeebled than ever he was before." During Holy Week he began to amend and walked about the infirmary with the help of his staff, and on the eve of Scherethursday, that is, Wednesday in Holy Week, he went to church to matins and lauds, which were sung that night by the monks. "And there by the respect of heavenly grace so great compunction and sweetness he received, that his holy devotion exceeded measure. Wherefore he might not contain himself from weeping and lauding God from midnight till six of the bell in the morning," when "he made to be called to him two of his brethren, one after another, which had power to hear confessions and give to penitents absolution,⁵ and to them both made purely and holy as meekly as he could his confession of all his sins and of the least offense of his religion or of the commandments of God, and with great contrition of heart desired his absolution and had it." . . . He spent all Holy Thursday in praising God and the next night went to the church to matins and lauds again.

His trance, which began on Good Friday morning, is most graphically described in chapter 2: "On Good Friday when the convent rose to come to church to say prime as they passed the chapter house they saw the same sick Brother lie prostrate and barefoot before the Abbot's seat; his face was flat to the ground, as though he should by the order ask mercy of every president. Then the brethren, seeing this marvel, ran thither, willing to take him up. They found him as a man lifeless, without any motion of any member of his body. Truly, his eyes were fallen deep down into his head and the eyes and nose of him covered with blood, wherefore they said all that he was dead. His feet were full cold, but in the remainder of his body was found a little warmth.

⁵ The form of absolution used by the abbot after the confiteor in the Evesham book is almost identical with that in use among Dominicans at the present day. It is the old form in use in St. Dominic's day throughout the Church, but the Evesham book inserts the word "pariter" between "perducat nos" and "ad vitam eternum."

"At the last was perceived in him a little thin breath and a moving of his heart. Then they washed his head, breast, hands and feet with cold water. And then first they saw all his body to tremble and quake, but anon he ceased and was insensible. So long time they mused and doubted what they might do to him while they saw him not verily dead, neither anything amending. At the last by counsel they had him to his bed, there to be kept with great attendance of keepers."

The third chapter tells how, while the brethren were wondering at this illness, a still more marvelous thing happened, for they found the great crucifix used in the Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, which had been kept all Lent in the church between the wall and the altar, bleeding freshly from the wound of the right foot and also of the right side. And the staff and shoes of the sick Brother were found by it. Greatly astonished at this miracle, as the monks firmly believed it to be, they met in the chapter house and all took "disciplines of rods," and then went to the church and lying prostrate on the ground, "said weepingly the seven psalms of penance to get our Lord's mercy." The sick Brother continued in the same unconscious state till sunset on Easter eve; they opened his mouth and cast in warm spices and herbs to revive him, but he could not swallow; they put plaisters to his breast and arms, but all in vain; they pricked and scraped the soles of his feet with needles, but no sign of life was to be seen, except a little red color in his cheeks and a little warmth in his body was perceptible. "Also they made a great horn to be blown there, but nothing it booteth."

Chapter 4 describes how he came to himself again on Easter eve about the time of Compline, very gradually, and the first intelligible words he said were: "O Sancta Maria! O Sancta Maria! Oh, my Lady Sancta Maria!" over and over again. Presently his eyes gradually opened and then he began to weep bitterly, and continued for a long time to do so, then after learning that he had been unconscious and like one dead since Good Friday morning, he asked for a crucifix to be brought him, that he might make his adoration, and when a silver one was given him he "watered the feet of the Cross with kisses and tears unto the tediousness of some standing by," for he made a very long thanksgiving for all the benefits he and the whole Church had received from God. At length his brethren begged him to take some meat after his long fast, and he directed them to bring him a little bread and honey, which he ate and then rose and went to matins with the others and entered the choir without any help at midnight.

We pass on now to Chapter 14, in which the monk tells us how

in his trance St. Nicholas of Bari appeared to him and led him through Purgatory, which terrible journey he goes on to describe. His conception and construction of Purgatory differ from the Mount of Purgatory of Dante, for he conceived it to be circular and on a plain; in the centre is Heaven, surrounded by rings of fields of pleasure or pain; the outermost circle of this huge circumference is entered at death by the soul when it leaves the body, and it is described as penetrating deeper and deeper towards the innermost centre through first the three fields of Pain, then through the field of Paradise, until it reaches the Gate of Heaven. This beautiful idea of the soul penetrating deeper and deeper and going ever more and more inwards through the three circles of Purgatorial pains and the field of the Paradise of joy and bliss seems to have a mystical meaning, teaching that the more interior the soul becomes the nearer it approaches to Heaven and the deeper it penetrates into celestial mysteries.

The picture he paints of the pains of Purgatory is very terrible as he followed "that worshipful old father, the holy and blessed Bishop St. Nicholas, whom he specially loved, to a certain region that was full wide and over horrible foul and miry of thick clay." Then he saw an innumerable company of wretched men and women of every condition, class, profession and order, ordained to divers kinds of pains according to their various sins. And he understood "for what sins they were punished and the kind of sin and the measure and quality of their satisfaction, the which they deserved either by contrition and confession of their offenses or by the remedies and help of other benefits done for them."

"Infinite kinds and diversities of pains were they that I saw. Some of them were roasted at the fire. Some were fryed in a pan. Some were also rasyd (i. e., scraped) with fiery nails unto the bones and to the loosing of their joints. Some were sodden in baths of pitch, and brimstone with an horrible stench and other things melted by heat as lead, brass and other divers metals. And some were gnawed with the venomous teeth of wonderful worms. Some also were cast down thick in a row and smitten with sharp stakes and palings whose ends were all fire. And while some were hanged on gallows, others were drawn with hooks, and some were beaten sore with scourges. . . . Truly, of the persons many were Bishops and Abbots and others were of other dignities. For I saw some that were clerks, monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen."

The person of highest rank whom he saw there was a certain King of England, probably William Rufus or Stephen; the monk himself lived in the reign of Richard I. He does not tell us the

name of the King he saw in Purgatory, but he was sometime King of England, and in his life was full mighty among the princes of this world. He was one who oppressed the people with taxes and revenged himself cruelly on any man who "slew his venery," that is, who poached in his preserves. Our Monk would seem to have been liberal in his political opinions, for he says that "hart and hind, bock and doe ought by the law of kind to be slain by every man." This King would put to death or cruelly maim these poachers, and as he did little penance for such acts in his life, he was terribly tortured in Purgatory, as also for the unlawful pleasures and lusts in which he had indulged.

The vision of this King is very graphically described. "He sat upon an horse that blew out of her mouth and nose a flame black as pitch, mingled with a smoke and stench of hell unto the grievous torment of him that sat thereon, who was armed at all points as he would have gone to battle. Truly, the armour that he wore was to him intolerable pain, for it was as bright burning iron is when it is beaten with hammers, and smiteth out fiery sparks," by which he was burnt both inside and outside. "Also as touching his helmet, his shield, his haburgeon and his leg-harness I leave out," for no man can tell how much he was pained by the burning heat and weight of them. "Soothly he would have given all the world if he might have been delivered from one spur, with which he was compelled to steer his wretched horse to run, whereby often he fell down headlong. Also the saddle he sat upon was stuck through on both sides with fiery brooches and nails, which was a ghastly sight for any man to behold, and the maw and inward bowels of him who sat in the saddle were sore-smitten through by the sharpness of the brooches and nails, and thus cruelly was he punished for the unlawful shedding of men's blood and for the foul sin of avowtry (perjury) that he used. This King complained sorely because neither his sons nor his friends whom he had left behind and who were indebted to him for many temporal goods did anything after his death for his relief and help. He bewailed, too, that his deceitful and flattering people had done nothing for him since his death, though he had done so much for them in his lifetime. The Monk saw him somewhat eased and relieved by the prayers of religious men to whom in his lifetime he was for God's sake oftentimes very benevolent, and through their prayers he hoped to be saved.

Another class of persons severely punished whom the Monk saw were fugitives from religion, who ran out of their order in which they had bound themselves to God, and afterwards turned again to the world as "a dog turneth again to his vomit," and

though they had bitterly repented and made a good confession before their death, their apostasy was grievously punished for a long time.

He wondered that he saw so few priests in Purgatory "out of the great number that is of them in all the world that had deserved pains after their death for breaking their vow of chastity, and to this it was answered that it was seldom that any of them were very penitent or contrite while they lived for their sins, wherefore there is no doubt that the great multitude of them are utterly damned."

We must remember that at no time in the Church's history could this reproach, often most unjustly brought against the Catholic priesthood by Protestant writers, have been deserved so much as in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; that is, about the period at which the Monk of Evesham was writing.

Here and there this terrible picture of Purgatorial suffering is lightened by an unconscious touch of nature making the twelfth and twentieth centuries akin, when he tells us that he saw "good religious men suffer full sore and grievous pains, only because they delighted and took a pleasure in the fairness of their hands and long fingers."

He points an excellent moral from the terrors of this first Field of Pain, saying: "Let us that be now alive still in this world see and consider by this how greatly we ought to give ourselves to chastising our wicked conditions and to amend our living and also how much we should labor to exercise us to keep the commandments of God, and to do good works by the which and the mercy of God we may deserve to be delivered before of so great evils. And also that our dear friends, as father and mother, sister and brother, and others that were sometime our lovers, there sore punished for their offenses, might be delivered the sooner from them by good deeds and works of mercy and pity devoutly done by us for their redemption and helping."

We come now to the second place of Purgatory, which he describes as a high hill, up almost to the clouds and divided from the first place of Purgatory. "And then lightly and sweetly we went on this same high hill. And there was under the farther side of this hill a full, deep valley and a dyke set with bushes and bracken on every side, hanging out, whose length no man might see. And in the lower part of the said valley was a full, broad pond of horrible black water. And out of that same pond busily brake a mist of an indescribable stench."

And from one side of this hill came forth a great fire, whose flames were cast up to heaven, and on the other side was great

cold of snow and hail and other cruel storms, so that he thought that he saw nothing so painful and cruel as that cold was. And this valley was as full of souls as hives swarm full of bees. And these souls were tormented by being first cast into the pond above mentioned, and then taken up and cast into the fire, "and they were borne up on high by the violent flames like sparks in a furnace, and so let down on the other side of the hill to the horrible cold of snow, hail and sharpness of storms, and then again cast down into the pond. And some of them were longer punished in the fire, and some in the cold, and some were tarried longer in the grievous stench of the pond. Some had lighter punishments than others, and the nearer they came to the end of the place the easier and softer waxed their pains. But the torments of this second place were much harder and sharper than those they saw in the first Field of Pain." He found also many more of his acquaintances in this second place than in the first; he recognized them immediately, although the stature and form of some of them were as though they had been lessened or thinned by torments.

In the third place of Purgatory, in which the worst vices and sins were punished, the torments and pains suffered were far worse than in either of the other two Fields of Pain. This was a great field set in a low ground apart from all other places, so that none might come thither except those that were there punished. "Truly, the over-part of this field was covered with a full, horrible cloud in the which was resided a smoke of brimstone with a mist; a great stench and a flame black as pitch was mingled with them, which brake out on every side like hills and so spread all abroad. And the plainness of that place was so replete and full-filled with worms as floors are wont to be strewn with rushes." He goes on to describe these words and the devils that he saw tormenting the souls with fiery instruments, and so great were the torments and horrors of this third place that being absent he cannot remember them without great horror, but the presence and companionship of St. Nicholas enabled him to bear the sight. We pass over the details of these tortures to describe some of the interviews he had with individual souls in Purgatory before we follow him to Paradise.

In the second place of Pain he saw a certain goldsmith who was a citizen of Evesham, whom he had known very well when alive and who had died suddenly from drink.

The story is told at too great length to quote in full, so we must endeavor to abridge it without spoiling it, for the account given by the goldsmith of his struggle against his sin is very pathetic. The Monk had had scruples about praying for the poor man's soul, whom all his neighbors had condemned to hell, because he under-

stood the saying of St. John that "there is a sin unto death I do not say that ye shall pray for such" to mean a sin continued in unto death, as this man's was; but, nevertheless, he did pray for him, and when we hear the life the man led we can but wonder at any one hesitating to do so.

When the Monk saw the goldsmith in Purgatory he had passed through the very worst of his pains, and he beheld him suffering lightly and in good hope, at which he wondered, and St. Nicholas, seeing that they knew each other, told the Monk to speak to his former friend. Accordingly, they saluted each other, and the goldsmith bowed to and worshiped St. Nicholas, who, he said, had saved him, and he then told them both how he came to be saved when, as he knew, all his friends believed him to be lost eternally, because he had died suddenly in his sin.

He acknowledges that he had continued in this sin all his life, but he says, "Nevertheless, it was not my will, for greatly it displeased me, and mickle I sorrowed that I knew not how to leave that vice. Soothly, oftentimes I rose against myself, surely purposing to leave and cast away the foul sin of drunkenness that I was held in. But, anon, what for the lust of drinking and the importunity of fellowship I was constrained to drink after the measure of mine old custom, whereby I was overcome and drawn again bound into the lust and custom of the same sin." . . . And then he goes on to tell of his great devotion to St. Nicholas, and to say that no matter how tipsy he might be in the evening he was always present in the morning at Matins, and often there in church before the parish priest. And he kept at his own cost a lamp ever burning in St. Nicholas' chapel. And he took care that the church was provided with all the necessary ornaments and lights, and if he could not afford to buy all that was needed himself, he got other parishioners to help him. Twice a year he went to confession and Holy Communion, at Christmas and Easter, "taking penance and in part diligently fulfilling it. Truly, I did not observe and keep those things that I was commanded of my ghostly father, for oftentimes I left some things that I should have done. And of the commandment of my ghostly father I fasted the days of Advent, as I did the Lent season. To the which days of Advent I added of mine own free will as many days before Advent as would make up the days of Lent. And so on Christmas Day I would be houselled and receive the holy Sacrament of our Lord's precious Body and Blood. But, alas for sorrow! when that I should have been that holy day of our Lord's birth more holier and devouter in my living than at other times, I turned me contrary to other works and businesses of a worldly custom, where-

fore it happened unto me also in my last end that the wicked angel of that devil Satan, the which is cause and kindler of all evil, scorned me. And also he had brought pleasant tidings of my loss and damnation to his father the devil, if the mercy and goodness of my lord St. Nicholas had not withstood him, therefore evermore to him be thanks for all his true services for my deliverance."

The goldsmith then describes his death, which took place on the third day after Christmas Day, when he fell into his old sin in spite of all the good resolutions he had made at his Christmas Communion, and died in his sleep. "For my departing out of this world was so hasty and swift that my soul was gone and passed out of my body ere my wife understood or knew it or had time to send for the priest."

The goldsmith had died about fifteen months before the Monk saw him in Purgatory, but by the merits of his patron, St. Nicholas, he was making quicker progress towards Paradise than any one he saw there, from which the Monk counsels his readers to serve the saints of God devoutly in this life, that when they come to Purgatory they may be helped by them in their great need.

Among others whom he saw in the first place of Purgatory was an anchoress whom he knew very well and loved greatly, and when he saw her there he believed it to be his imagination, for she was alive when he fell into his ecstasy, but when he came to himself and a few days after wished to send her a message by a friend, he learned that she had died while he was unconscious, and then he believed it was true that he had really seen her in Purgatory. He tells us that "she was stable and steadfast in countenance and fair of beholding, whom the laborious way that she had gone had wearied a little, and with the pains of fire that others were involved here and there she was often touched and somewhat burnt; but she full little counted it and hasted her speedily on the journey that goeth to Paradise."⁶

He also saw in this same first Field of Purgatory a certain Bishop whom he knew, who was born "in this ground of Inglande and had his bishopric beyond the seas." He had died that same year about the Feast of St. Michael, and the Monk saw him burn-

⁶ We have not been able to trace this anchoress, but probably she was a Benedictine nun living as an anchoress in the Benedictine priory at Worcester, as there was accommodation there for two anchoresses, who lived enclosed in cells attached to the priory in 1240—that is, about forty years after the Revelation to the monk. In the Middle Ages anchoresses frequently chose the precincts of monasteries as safe places in which to have their cells placed. Or it is possible this anchoress, as the monk knew her so well, may have inhabited the cell at Evesham in which the anchorite Wulfsey at one time lived. See "Anchoresses of the West," by Francesca M. Steele, page 248.

ing almost continually in flames of fire because "of the vicious life he lived in his youth." But as he "burnt busily in the fire he had evermore a full honest cloth upon him, the which not only was hurt by the fire, but also was made by it fairer and seemlier than it was before." And St. Nicholas told the Monk that this cloth was a privilege granted to the Bishop, because in his life he had ever had compassion on the poor and naked and had liberally relieved them, "so his clothing shall never lack fairness till he has fulfilled his penance and taken of God the stole of everlasting joy and bliss." In the second place of Pain he saw three other Bishops and an Archbishop of Canterbury. But now from all this darkness and horror and pain and suffering we will follow our Monk and his leader to "the full, merry and jocund place of Paradise."

He warns us that no man can sufficiently describe the delights of this place, but promises that as he can he will. After passing through the three dread places of Purgatory they went further, and as they went by little and little and more and more appeared to them a full, fair light and with the light came also a sweet and pleasant savor. Then they came to a field in which were all manner of fair and beautiful flowers, that gave them incredible pleasure to behold! And in this field they saw "infinite thousands of souls full, jocund and merry in a full, sweet rest after their penance and after their purgation. And those souls that were in the beginning of this field had on white clothing, but it was not very bright, neither well-shining, nevertheless it had no spot of blackness nor of any uncleanness on it." And he saw many there whom he knew full well in the world, and he mentions a certain Prior who had lived devoutly and died holily, and a certain young monk who lived in the same monastery as this Prior; also a "worshipful priest," who in his life did much good by his preaching, and a certain Abbess of wonderful conversation whom he had known when he was a child. The Prior seems to have been a very great saint, for "he bare evermore while he lived the habit of a monk both on his body and in his heart, from the time of his childhood to his old age and to his last end." He was very meek and patient and used great abstinence and long watching, and when necessity compelled him to be about works of charity, he would be ever saying some psalms or other devout prayers to God. He suffered the loss of an eye a year or two before his death, and other limbs of his body failed him, but he was never absent from choir or any conventual duties, and when the hour of his death drew near he lay in a hair shirt and ashes, and after saying many prayers with great compunction he expired blessing his brethren devoutly.

The night before he died this Prior had a vision about the hour of Matins, in which he saw our Lord Jesus and our Blessed Lady

St. Mary coming to him, "and with a full, meek sign they made a token to him that he should follow them, and immediately after he called for his brethren and told them the vision that he had seen, and announced to them that he would die the next day, and so he did."

It was this Prior who pointed out to the Monk of Evesham the above-mentioned young monk of his monastery, who had lived a most pure and innocent life as a monk from a child and had died young, fortelling the day of his death and the hour of it. "And also heavenly melody was heard at his passing, as many can tell that were there in the monastery at the same time." Both the Prior and this young monk had suffered a little in Purgatory for their faults, but the Prior trusted to receive a greater reward in Paradise than the young monk, because by living longer he had been able to do more good works and win more merit.

The Abbess had died thirteen years before our Monk saw her in Paradise; she had been a very wise woman, very devout, very fervent and very zealous in ruling her community, and when the Monk saw her she had only newly arrived from Purgatory, and although "she had upon her clean clothing, it was not very white nor shining."

She had suffered very sharp pains in the first place of Purgatory, because she had not overcome the vice of vainglory and for "other innumerable things by which good people offend," which the Monk passes by. But he was very much surprised to learn from her that she had specially suffered the pains of Purgatory because she had "loved her kinsfolk overmuch carnally" and had given them much of the goods of her monastery, and this while some of her spiritual daughters were in need of clothing and other necessities.

The Monk of Evesham marveled when he heard this, because "he knew no prelate who used so great sharpness to their kinsfolk as she seemed to him to show to her cousins." And also instead of marrying her nephews and nieces she took them into religion to serve God, and she behaved so sternly to them specially that "while to strangers she was seen to be friendly and easy, to her cousins she was right unmild." And she used to inquire their faults, and if perchance she found them in fault she would punish them full bitterly. And she favored no brother or sister so much as those who were not her kin. The Monk said this to the Abbess, and she replied that, although it was true, nevertheless she could find no excuse when examined by God for the carnal affection and love that she had inwardly to her relations after she was bound to religion. And when the worshipful Abbess had told him

these and other things he and St. Nicholas went forth further into the same joyful field, and as they went more inward and further into that joyful place of Paradise "they had evermore a clear light and felt a sweeter savor, and those whom they found and saw there were whiter and gladder than those whom they had seen before."

"And whereto should I tarry here now to number the persons and their merits which I saw there that I knew sometime before in the world and some that I knew not before? For all that were there in that place were ordained to be the citizens of the high and everlasting Jerusalem, and all had passed the strife and the battle of this world and were victors of devils, and so lightly they went through all pains as they were before less cumbered and held by wretched living and worldly vices."

Meditation on the Passion of our Blessed Lord was evidently a great and favorite devotion of the Monk of Evesham, for he makes the contemplation of the Crucifixion one of the joys of Paradise. But he tells us that the things they saw as they went forth further into this same place no tongue can tell and no man's mind may worthily consider nor describe it in words.

A vision of the holy Cross of Christ's Passion was presented and shown to infinite thousands of holy souls a little further on, who were standing about it and worshiping it as though our Lord had been present in His body. "Truly, there was seen the meek Redeemer of mankind, our sweet Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as He had been done fresh upon the Cross." And at this great and wonderful spectacle, which he describes in terms too solemn and realistic to quote, "stood His holy Mother, our Blessed Lady St. Mary, not now in heaviness and mourning, but right gladsome and joying, and there also stood with her the sweet disciple of Christ, St. John, the blessed evangelist, and who may now conceive in mind how those holy souls ran thither on every side gladly and lightly to see and behold that blessed sight." This vision did not continue very long, but was taken away from the blessed souls, who then returned to their own places with great joy and gladness.

The two pilgrim souls now come to the Gate of Heaven, after they have gone more and more inward, the beauty of the place and their joy therein ever increasing as they advanced, till at last they beheld a full, glorious wall of crystal, whose height no man might see and length no man might consider. And when they reached the wall they saw therein "a full, fair, bright, shining gate which stood open, save that it was signed and laid over with a cross. The cross was set in the midst of that gate, and now it was lifted up on high, and so gave them that came hither an open

and a free entry, and afterward it was let down again and so barred others out that would have come in. But how joyful they were that went in, and how reverently they tarried that stood without abiding the lifting up of the cross again I cannot tell. Soothly here St. Nicholas and I stood still together, and the liftings up of the cross and the lettings down again, whereby some went in and some tarried without, I beheld with great wonder." And at the last St. Nicholas and the Monk came thither to the same gate hand in hand. "And when we came thither the cross was lifted up. And so they that were there went in. Soothly then my fellow St. Nicholas freely went in, and I followed, but suddenly and unadvisedly the cross came down upon our hands and parted me from my fellow St. Nicholas, and when I saw this full sore afraid I was. Then said St. Nicholas to me: 'Be not afraid, but only have full certain trust in our Lord Jesus Christ, and doubtless thou shalt come in.' And after this my hope and my trust came again and the cross was lifted up and so I came in."

Truly, our Monk was a poet, though he wrote in prose, and a great mystic, though so little known, for is there even in the "*Divina Commedia*" a more beautifully symbolic idea than this of the Gate of Heaven being barred by the Cross, through the elevation of which alone souls could enter Heaven?

He now attempts to describe the brightness of the light inside the gate, which though it shone more marvelously than any he had ever yet seen, yet "dulled not a man's sight, but rather sharpened it." But they were not permitted to see anything inside except the light and the crystal wall through which they had entered, and from the ground to the top of the wall were steps, up which all the souls who had entered were climbing, without any labor or difficulty, and the higher they went the gladder they were. And then the Monk looked up high and he saw sitting on a throne of joy our Lord in the likeness of a man, but yet he knew for certain that this place where he "saw our Lord sitting was not the Heaven of heavens, where the blessed spirits of the angels and the holy souls of righteous men join in the sight of seeing God in His majesty as He is, for no mortal man can see that sight."

They were not permitted to remain long here, for St. Nicholas, who held the Monk by the hand, told him very soon that he must now go back again to himself and the world, "and turn from that heavenly bliss to this world's wretchedness."

The Revelation closes with a marvelous description of the sweet peal of bells that the Monk heard in Paradise, and tells how he came to himself. "And while the holy confessor St. Nicholas

yet spake with me, suddenly I heard there a solemn peal and a ringing of a marvelous sweetness, as if all the bells in the world had been rung together at once. Truly, in this peal and in this ringing brake out also a marvelous sweetness and a varying mingling of melody-sound withal. And I knew not whether the greatness of the melody or the sweetness of the sounding of the bells was more to be wondered at. And to so great a noise I took good heed and full greatly my mind was suspended to hear it. Soothly immediately that that great and marvelous sound and noise ceased, suddenly I saw myself parted from the sweet fellowship of my duke and leader St. Nicholas."

He now goes on to describe his coming back to life after his trance. "Then I returned to myself again, and I heard the voices of my brethren that stood about its (sic) bed, also my bodily strength came again to me a little and a little, and my eyes opened to the use of seeing as you saw right well. Also my sickness and feebleness by which I was for so long a time so sorely diseased was outwardly gone from me, and I sat up before you as strong and mighty as I was before sorrowful and heavy. And I weened that I had been then in the church before the altar, where I first worshiped the cross."

He goes on to say that while he thought that this vision had only lasted for the space of one Matins, he found from his brethren on coming to himself that it had lasted for nearly two days. And from that time it was most delightful to him to hear any solemn peal of bells ring, for it always brought to his memory the sweet peal and melody he had heard when he was among the blessed souls in Paradise. And when he heard the monastery bells ring on Easter eve for Compline, he knew that the bells he heard in Paradise were ringing so beautifully to usher in the same feast of Easter.

For many days after he returned to himself the young Monk was continually weeping, and then a miracle is recorded in chapter the last but one, which the writer quotes as a proof that the Revelation was true, lest he says there should be such great infidelity or infirmity of any one as would prevent him from believing in the truth of this vision, in which it is evident the Monk himself and all his religious brethren most firmly believed. It seems that for over a year before his trance he had suffered intolerable pain from a great sore, large and broad, on his left leg, like a cancer or canker as it is here written. And so great was the pain in this sore that the Monk was wont to say it was as though a hot plate of iron was bound tightly to his leg. And no ointment or poultices or any doctor had ever done him any good, though he had

tried many remedies. But during this trance he was so completely cured that he himself marveled with the other monks to "feel and see that the pain and ache with the wound were clean gone, so that no token of it nor any sign of redness or of whiteness remained." The only difference between this left leg and the right one now was that there was no hair in the place where the sore had been.

Whether the Revelation was true or false, the Monk was so firmly convinced that it came from God that he wrote it down for the warning, comfort and instruction of his countrymen, and, at any rate, it contains, as we hope we have shown, much that is both edifying and beautiful, to say nothing of the many incidental touches that throw such light upon the great faith and piety of the people of England in pre-Reformation days, when the country **merited her proud title of the Dowry of Mary.**

F. M. STEELE.

Stroud, England.

THE MARIAVITES.

THE miscellaneous and nondescript army of men who, in nearly every country of Europe, are waging an open or covert war upon the Church of Christ and her dogmas has of late years recruited its ranks most largely in Catholic Poland. This newest ally of the powers of error is all the more dangerous and insidious because, little known and appreciated so far at home and abroad, he stalks unchecked throughout the land in the Scriptural "sheep's clothing." For, depending upon the reawakened interest in mysticism, which is one of the strange contradictions of our own days, **this Jansenistic sect has been able to work great havoc in an incredibly short space of time.** The condemnation of the movement by the Holy See on September 15, 1906, came none too soon. From the Papal bull we should learn to be wise enough to be on our guard against the well-planned and systematic propaganda which the new sect carries on. With its vague teaching and mystical sensationalism the Mariavites would no doubt make rapid progress in America,

¹ Bei den Mariaviten. Eindrücke von einer neuen romfreien katholischen Kirche. Lichterfeld: Berlin, 1911.

² Mankietnichy i mankietnictwo. Posen, 1910.

³ Kacerska sekta mankietnikow, jeg poczatek i odstepstwo od kasciola. Warsaw, 1906.

⁴ De Wijding van J. Kowalski tot Bisschop der Mariaviten. Utrecht, 1911.

⁵ Mariavity v Tzarstve polskom. Solkine. St. Petersburg, 1910.

where religion must daily change its face to be acceptable to certain men who have strayed far afield in search of a new Christ and an up-to-date Gospel.

Up to a short time ago we had little opportunity of learning anything definite about the Mariavite teaching. The article in Herder's "Conversations Lexikon" is good as far as it goes. The "Catholic Encyclopedia" has overlooked the movement. The latest work by Arthur Rhode¹ is absolutely worthless and unreliable. The best authorities, which, however, are accessible to a very limited circle, are J. Kantal², Dr. Barmacin³, E. Driessen⁴ and I. Rovinsky⁵. We borrow all we shall have to say in this article from these four standard witnesses.

The adherents of the movement are known by various names. Thus they glory in the name of Mariavites, which they claim was revealed to the foundress by heaven. Sometimes, too, they are called Kozlovites, after the patronymic of their foundress. More frequently still they go by the name of Manchettists, from the fact that the priests, the better to show their spirit of evangelical poverty, adopted the practice of wearing black cuffs, or "monkietnicz," as these are called in the language of the land.

The foundress of the sect, Felicia Kozłowska, was born at Płozk in 1862, being the daughter of the seamstress, Anna Olszewska, who had married the forester, James Kozłowska, and borne him several children. In the early 80's the family settled at Warsaw, where Felicia enjoyed the advantages of a convent education. Returning to Płozk, she opened a tailoring establishment of her own, which never seemed to thrive much. She was frequently reduced to the necessity of depending upon the charity of her friends. Seeking consolation for her dejected spirits, she chose as her spiritual director the Capuchin, Father Honorat, who lived in the nearby convent of Zakrocym. With his consent she entered the Third Order of St. Francis. About this time a certain priest, graduate in theology of the Catholic Theological Academy of St. Petersburg, Casimer Pryzjemski, came to Płozk as curate. He was a very ascetic man, neurasthenic and poorly grounded in theology, as Dr. Barmacin remarks. He was eaten up with the desire to reform the clergy and bring them on the ways of a highly exaggerated ascetical life. Basing his proposed reform on the Third Order of St. Francis, Pryzjemski received the approval of the Capuchins, Fathers Procop and Honorat, who in their turn introduced him to Felicia Kozłowska.

Now, it happened that precisely at this time Felicia began to speak confidentially to her friends about a vision which had been vouchsafed her on the feast of Portiuncula, August 2, 1893, in which God had communicated to her His wish to see a congregation of priests and pious women founded, to be known by the name of Mariavites.

By means of this association the world at large, and especially the lax clergy of the land, would soon be brought back to fervor and God-fearing ways. Her tailoring establishment was designated as the chosen centre of the movement, and she was entrusted with the supreme direction of all the members, even those of the clergy. "The priests," so she avers the Saviour spake to her, "who open their hearts and minds to you will receive as a reward for their humility an extraordinary spirit of prayer, together with other special graces." The preliminary work towards the foundation of the society was undertaken by Pryzjemski, who implicitly believed in the visions of Felicia. Devotion to Our Lady of Perpetual Help, and later on to the Blessed Sacrament, formed the distinctive mark of the organization. The primitive rule of St. Francis was adopted as the basis of the society. The vows of poverty, chastity and obedience were enjoined, and the clergy began to wear black cuffs as their distinctive badge. As Franciscans they soon instituted provincials. Pryzjemski was chosen for the Diocese of Plozk, Wiechowicz for Warsaw, Prochniewski for Lublin. Kowalska was elected general. A convent of women, who followed the rule of St. Clare, was opened, with Kozłowska acting as superioress. At the same time Kozłowska arrogated to herself undisputed authority over the masculine branch of the association, which so far was entirely composed of priests, some fifty in number. Chief amongst these was the spiritual director of the Seminary of Plozk, Leo Golebiowska, who has the distinction of having first called the foundress "*Mateczka*"—"the Little Mother"—by which name Kozłowska is always spoken of by her own. The sugar and milk for his tea, of which he now began to deprive himself, were daily carried to the foundress. Other clerical adherents of the first hour—all of whom were from the ranks of the junior clergy—were Ceslaus Czerwinski, Rytel, Zbirochowicz and Wenceslaus Zebrowski.

The strict poverty which the first clerical members of the association practiced soon made it possible for them to purchase an imposing, palatial residence for the *Mateczka*, who had in the meantime assumed the religious name of Maria Francesca and adopted a gray garb. Here the meetings of the society were convened until prohibited by the Bishop of Plozk, who forbade his priests to join hands in the movement. The clerical members were dispersed. This action had the effect of spreading the organization in the outlying corners of the diocese. For the priests, driven from a centre where propaganda for the cause could be made in clerical circles, obtained leave from the foundress to admit laymen as members of the Third Order of the society. The better to dupe the poorly instructed but pious peasants, these priests began to call their organization by the

orthodox name of "Confraternity of Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament." The new recruits bound themselves to spend a fixed time each day before the Blessed Sacrament. Fifteen persons were gathered together in a "circle," as it was called, at the head of which stood a zelator or zelatrix. Each circle was obliged to have a Mass offered up on given occasions, at which all the respective members must be present. It is probably an exaggeration when we read that certain circles gave as much as one thousand rubles for this Mass. The confraternity spread very rapidly. After scarcely one year's existence the membership was computed at half a million. Maria Francesca reserved to herself the headship of this branch of the organization. At her command the Mariavite priests refused to accept stole fees. This was a very sagacious step, as it made them immensely popular with the people. It must also be added that these priests lived rigidly poor and abstemious lives. Meat was absolutely forbidden them, and the more fervent amongst them lived the lives of vegetarians. They also were promoters of the cause of total abstinence from intoxicants. A very lucrative traffic in devotional articles soon developed amongst the clergy. Chief amongst these devotions was the so-called "Marian Communion," which was nothing else than the swallowing of a small piece of paper bearing a print of Our Lady of Perpetual Help. So popular had devotion to Our Lady under this invocation become in a short time that the Mariavite priests, without so much as a voice of opposition from the people, removed all images of the saints from the churches, not even sparing those of Our Lady of Czenstochowa. The members of the confraternity now began to wear publicly, as their distinctive insignia, a medal on one side of which a Host was engraved and on the other Our Lady of Perpetual Help. From the sale of these and other objects of devotion the priests soon amassed an enormous wealth. Despite the verbal prohibition of the Russian Government, a large strip of land was purchased in Plozk, on which soon arose a convent, in which vestments were embroidered or repaired under the eyes of the Mateczka. The contingent of Mariavites at Warsaw contributed the furniture for the convent, which was of the most gorgeous kind. The private apartments of Maria Francesca gave no indications of poverty.

With the year 1904 the second period of the Mariavites begins. As was to be expected, the conduct of the innovators aroused grave fears and misgivings amongst the clergy who had not been infected with the new teachings. The absolute subjection of the clergy to a woman gave special cause for complaint. When the Papal encyclical of 1902, on the Holy Eucharist, appeared, the Mariavite priest, Leo Golebiowska, forthwith translated it after his own fashion into

the vernacular. His version of the Papal document was made to read as a formal and authoritative approbation of the teaching and practices of the new organization. The Bishop of Plozk, Mgr. Szembek, at once ordered a minute investigation of the movement by competent hands. Kosłowska and Gobeliewski, who had been chosen to defend the Mariavites and set forth their teaching, were carefully interrogated by the two episcopal delegates. A full report of the entire process was forwarded to Rome. The Mateczka, accompanied by several of her priests, proceeded to the Eternal City, where Kowalska acted as spokesman. A letter from Father Honorat approving the new society was circulated in Rome until it was discovered to have been forged. The Holy Office, having thoroughly searched into the matter, declared the visions of Maria Francesca to be hallucinations, and commanded all priests to sever connections with her. With a genuine spirit of Jansenistic submission, the Mateczka declared that she renounced her authority over the priests and pious women whom she had won to her views; that she would desist completely from extending the movement; that she would look upon her visions as deceptions; that she would hand over her writings to the Bishop and accept the priest whom he would designate as her confessor. The priests who had done great work to further the society, Czerwinski, Zbirochowicz and Wiechowicz, also promised to withdraw. But the first named of the three wrote a letter to Kozłowska in December, 1905—although he had that very same month promised the Bishop to break entirely with her—full of words of encouragement to go on with the task, despite all obstacles and opposition.

Mgr. Wnukowski, who had succeeded to the see on the death of Mgr. Szembek, having settled by a court of inquiry that false theological views and an extravagant asceticism were to be found amongst the Mariavites, condemned them in September, 1905. At once all the leaders affected by this condemnation promised to submit without reserve. In secret, however, they began to agitate against the Bishop. Golebiowska's garbled translation of the Papal Encyclical on the Eucharist was adduced as a confirmation of their action. They also declared to have received another Papal letter, in which all the clergy who did not make common cause with them were reprehended in no unmistakable terms. Again the Bishop ordered an investigation. Having discovered downright heretical teaching amongst them, he summoned the leaders to appear before a council of the Bishops on February 8, 1906. Przyjemski and Rytel handed the assembled prelates a written document, in which the Mariavites solemnly declared their break with Rome. The step had been long contemplated, for the Mariavite priests had long

since recognized the authority of the Pope alone in their regard. Kowalska and Przyjemski hastened to Rome. They demanded that the Pope or Holy Office publish a document to this effect: "Maria Francesca was created a saint by God. She is the mother of mercy for all who have been called to eternal life by God. The Mariavite priests have received the express command from God to spread devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and Our Lady of Perpetual Help throughout the world, all canonical prescriptions and all ecclesiastical or civil opposition notwithstanding." Pius X. received the two priests most fatherly, and they promised him obedience and submission. They also promised in writing to submit to God's will as manifested in the direction of the Holy Father; they also promised to obey their Ordinaries. But no sooner had they returned to their own than they began to preach that the Pope had released them from all obedience to their Bishops; had approved their teachings and desired them to go on with their practices. Furthermore, they stated that Cardinal Vannutelli had advised them to gather all possible documentary evidence in order to undertake a process for the deposition of all priests and Bishops who were not of their manner of thinking.

And immediately Maria Francesca named Kowalska Archbishop!

Cardinal Vannutelli forthwith denied the words which these two unscrupulous men had put into his mouth. On April 5, 1906, the Pope addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Warsaw, as also to the Bishops of Plozk and Lublin, in which the condemnation of the Mariavites of September 5, 1904, was renewed and emphasized.

The innovators were now forced to come out into the open and declare outright what course of action they proposed to follow with regard to the Papal utterance. Kowalska, in a circular letter to his clergy, put down in brief the leading doctrines of the sect. It reads as follows:

"The Mariavites believe:

"(1) All that the Catholic Church teaches.

"(2) That God created Maria Francesca Kozłowska very holy and gave her the same graces which the Blessed Virgin and Mother of God received.

"(3) That mercy, as in fact the whole world, are in the hands of St. Maria Francesca, so that no one can obtain grace without her help and intercession.

"(4) That prayers to St. Maria Francesca are not only useful, but also necessary to withstand the assaults of Satan and to strengthen the soul in grace.

"Whoever believes all this is a true Mariavite.

"If the Mariavites form the minority of a parish, they must re-

linquish the parish church, retaining, however, the right to use the mortuary chapel in the cemetery. The Catholics may select their own pastor and make use of the parish church and parish house without any molestation on our part.

"But if the Mariavites constitute even less than one-third part of a given parish, the Catholics can lay no claim even to the mortuary chapel, but must come to an agreement with us, so as to be able to build their own chapel for themselves.

"Children under the age of fourteen must practice the religion of their parents; when they have reached the age of fourteen they can settle the matter of their religion for themselves.

"Given from Sobtdka, Aqril 13, 1906."

The dogmatic evolution of the Mariavites went on apace every day. Thus they soon began to teach that the visions of Maria Francesca were one of the sources of the doctrine of the Church. She was the spouse of Christ, and celebrates her mystic espousals with Christ at given times in heaven, and the feast lasts three weeks. Archbishop Kowalska was permitted once to be present at the feast. The Angel Gabriel announced to Maria Francesca that she was to become the mother of Antichrist. This caused her irrepressible pain. Recovering from her faint, she learned the will of God and submitted with the words: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord." Antichrist was born of her, having at his birth the age of three and one half or four years and possessing all his teeth. The extreme length to which a sickly neuroticism may reach may best be seen from the litany which all Mariavites recite in church before the image of St. Maria Francesca:

Holy Mary, Mother of God, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, spouse of Christ, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, mother of mercy, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca; model of humility, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, model of virgins, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, foundress of the Mariavites, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, true adorer of the Blessed Sacrament, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, who poureth forth thy glory, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, who beareth all injuries, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, defamed in journals, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, torn by the tongues of men, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, victrix over Satan, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, true medicine against temptations, Pray for us.

Holy Maria Francesca, ignored and forgotten by the world, Pray for us.

By thy sufferings, Obtain us grace from God.

By thy great obedience to God, Obtain us grace from God.

By thy humility and patience, Obtain us grace from God.

By thy true spirit of sacrifice, Obtain us grace from God.

By thy adoration of the true God, Obtain us grace from God.

By thy enlightened obedience, Obtain us grace from God.

That we may glorify Thee with Maria Francesca, We beseech
Thee, O God.

That we may remain her sons, We beseech Thee, O God.

That we may not neglect the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament,
We beseech Thee, O God.

Let us pray:

O holy Maria Francesca, spouse of Jesus Christ, obtain for us from
God the grace to behold Him together with thee, forever and
forever. Amen.

These reformers of Catholicism seek to purify the faith by following the example of their neighbors, the Russians, who have always been lucky enough to discover new Christs and new Madonnas! But this exaltation and canonization of the Mateczka at the hands of her own had become necessary for the extension of the sect. At the hour of their rupture with Rome the Mariavites could boast of fifty priests, amongst whom were seven doctors of theology and nearly half a million faithful. At the end of 1907 Professor Jesipow, who had gone to great trouble to make an accurate census, put down their total numbers at seventy thousand. The reason of this rapid decline lay, in great part, in the civil trial which the Mateczka invited. It came about thus: Nawroki, editor of the widely circulated "*Niedziela*," wrote one day early in 1907 to this effect: "The Mateczka, who has just finished a visitation of her diocese, led, up to a short time ago, the life of an adventuress. Meanwhile she has grown tired of this manner of life, and is trying to expiate her past faults by an ascetical life." Now, Maria Francesca grew wrath at once, because her own accepted the holiness of her life as one of the basic doctrines of the movement. She was of the opinion that no one knew of her past doings, or else would not have the courage to speak against her now that she was the ideal and more of her people. Hence she sued Nawroki for libel. The latter brought forward as witnesses the Rev. Peter Dzieniakowski, a man over sixty years of age, and the laymen Adam Koszntski and Szyling. The Mariavite priests Golebiowska and Prochniewicz and the pious women, or Mariavite nuns, Bronisz, Myga and Dembowska rallied to the defense of the Mateczka. In the very first stage of the process Maria Francesca perjured herself in declaring that none of her witnesses were relatives. It

was soon shown, however, that Bronisz was her aunt. Despite this unpropitious beginning, the witnesses were loud in proclaiming the holiness of the Mateczka's life. In the afternoon quite other evidence was brought forward, showing the loose morals of her past life. The jury, after deliberating not quite ten minutes, rendered a verdict in favor of Nowraki. It was a severe blow to the Mariavite movement, and opened the eyes of the simple-minded to the true character of the much-vaunted saint more effectively than the Papal condemnation. The absurd honors paid to Maria Francesca by her followers are but a desperate effort to save her good name and rehabilitate her before the world. It was absolutely necessary to canonize the Mateczka after the trial if she was longer to be foisted upon the people as the chosen instrument of God. The popular daily journal, "Nowoje Wremia," acceded to a proposal of the Mariavite leaders to undertake a systematic campaign of advertising the virtues of Maria Francesca. To the same end several Mariavite priests wrote a brochure⁶ which swarms not only with the vilest attacks upon the Church and her ministers, but is full of the most patent caviling and twisting of moral principles in favor of the society. Even Lehmkuhl is made to do service to the cause. The book was intended for popular use, and may justly be looked upon as the Mariavite laymen's official handbook of moral theology. As a sample of the conclusions at which these skulking theologians arrive, we will quote only one sentence: "Mariavite laymen who receive absolution from Mariavite priests who have been excommunicated receive an increase of divine grace, and do not commit a sin thereby as do orthodox Catholics. This assertion of ours is an incontestable truth."⁷ At the same time the leaders sought and readily obtained a guarantee of protection from the Russian Government. With the native Muscovite hatred of all things Roman, the civil authorities at St. Petersburg on December 11, 1906, officially recognized the society as a legalized organization.

The Mariavites found a man after their own hearts in the Russian general, Alexander Kirecv, who had spent many years of his life in trying to bring about a union of the moribund Old Catholics with the Greek Orthodox Church. This military theologian advised the Mariavites to draw the last conclusions of their teachings, which would be nothing else than to constitute themselves a national church. Thus they would also insure their future existence, becoming, politically, part of the Russian Established Church. With the approval of the Mateczka, Kowalska proceeded

⁶ Mariavity: oproverjenie lojnkx slukhow o Mariavitakh. Lodz, 1908.

⁷ *Ibid*, 110.

to Utrecht for episcopal consecration at the hands of the Jansenist Bishop.⁸ Others took the road to Switzerland for ordination. At the Convention of the Old Catholics at Vienna in September, 1908, the Mariavites subscribed to the following fundamental doctrines of the Old Catholic Church:

(1) The Mariavite priests recognize as Sacred Scripture all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments.

(2) They accept the Catholic criterion of the primitive Church "quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est," a criterion which permits them to accept historically the true dogmas and to distinguish them from the theological speculations which cannot be imposed in conscience.

(3) They accept the episcopal and synodal constitution of the Universal Church and the disciplinary, liturgical and administrative autonomy of particular churches.

(4) They profess the Creed sanctioned by the Councils of Nice and Constantinople and accepted by the Universal Church, and they accept the dogmatic definitions of the œcumenic councils of 431, 451, 553, 681, 787.

(5) They admit the seven sacraments as these are exposed and interpreted in Holy Scripture and in the universal tradition of the first eight centuries.

(6) They reject, as contrary to Scripture and tradition, the institution of the modern Papacy, which was developed especially in the Western Councils of Lateran, Trent and the Vatican.

Conformable with this programme the Mariavites began to teach that there is only one head of the Church, the invisible head, Jesus Christ; that the Church is divided into national and autonomous churches; that Christian unity consists in the bond of charity; that there is no superior and infallible judge in matters of faith; that the ideal church is the Dutch Jansenistic Church. For the Popes had corrupted the doctrine of Christianity on grace—hence the Bulls of Innocent X. and Clement XI. are monstrous impositions on the faithful; hence, too, the religious of Port Royal were heroes of the purity of the faith. Frequent confession is not necessary, since Holy Communion remits mortal sin. Indulgences must be rejected, because no man has the power of attributing the fruit of good works to the souls of the deceased. The Immaculate Conception is not to be admitted as a dogma, because it was not defined by an œcumenic council. The celibacy of the clergy is not obligatory, because a legitimate marriage is to be preferred

⁸ P. Petrouchevsky: Vstuplenie mariavitov v soizn s staro-katolikami i posviachtchenie pervago mariavitskago episkopa, in "Rukovodstvo dlia selsk, pastyrej," Kiev 28-29; 238-257; 270-277.

to concubinage. The unity of the Church does not demand the absolute identity of opinions and theological doctrines. The chief obligation of the Mariavite is daily adoration of the Blessed Sacrament at a fixed hour. The accepted formula on this head of Mariavite dogma is: "Above all things else, pray—the rest will take care of itself." The Mariavites vindicated their right to perform all liturgical acts in the Polish language. These tenets of the Mariavite heresy are to be found in the official textbook of dogma which the leaders published at Lodz in 1910 as a reply to a series of articles in which the professor of the Seminary at Plozk, Adolf Szelazek, attacked the theological statements and pretensions of Kowalska.⁹

According to the Mariavite Calendar of 1911 the sect to-day can boast of ninety parishes in the Provinces of Kalisz, Lomza, Piotokov, Plozk, Radom, Siedlic, Suvalsk, Warsaw, Gradno, Kiev, Kovno, Wilna. They are governed by three Bishops, the Minister General, Michael Kowalska; the Vicar General, Romano Proch-niewski, and Leo Golebiowska. Thirty-one priests minister to one hundred thousand adepts. The clergy wear a gray cassock, on the breast of which an ostensorium is embroidered, and go about in sandals. The clergy is very active in conducting primary, evening, normal and industrial schools. All forms of social activity are carried on by the priests. Skolimowski is editor of two journals which appear at Lodz. The "Maryavita" appeared at first weekly in sixteen pages; since January, 1911, it appears monthly in sixty-four pages. The "Mariawitische Nachrichten," which appeared at first twice each week, has been changed into a tri-weekly. The Mariavites possess no seminary or novitiate for the education of their clergy. After having studied theology and ecclesiastical discipline in the house of a pastor, the aspirant to the priesthood goes up for ordination. The leaders of the sect have divided up the world into provinces according to the various nationalities. Thus a Dutch, French, German, Russian and English province are next contemplated as fields for the proselyting zeal of the Mariavite clergy.

This is in brief outline a history of the birth and evolution of a heresy which has wrought great havoc in a Catholic land. The Mariavite heresy has not the saving quality of originality. Dogmatically, it is a synthesis of the errors of the Jansenists and Old Catholics, with a few exaggerated and extravagant ascetical ideas and practices thrown in for good measure. In organization it is a hopeless mixture of the Catholic concepts of the hierarchy and monastic orders. The whole organism is tainted with a re-

⁹ Wobronie zasad ewangelii: czesc I., dogmatzna. Lodz, 1910, page 190.

volting neuroticism. Maria Francesca may well serve as the patron saint of highly developed religious suffragettes. If the heresy has succeeded so far, it is because the clergy profess piety and mortification and has turned to its own ends the revived devotion to the Holy Eucharist manifest throughout the world to-day. Many a day will pass before the heresy is driven out of Poland, for it has worked its way into popular favor. And in the meantime its leaders, who are shrewd, unscrupulous men who know how to make use of the press, are planning a conquest of those Catholic emigrants from the fatherland who have settled abroad and are living in the diaspora.

HILDEBRAND VAN AMSTEL, O. P.

THOMAS DWIGHT.

TOWARD the end of the year 1907 there came to me, with the author's autograph and his Christmas greetings, a copy of "A Clinical Atlas of Variations of the Bones of the Hands and Feet," by Thomas Dwight, M. D., LL. D., Parkman professor of anatomy at the Harvard Medical School. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1907.) The volume was one of the important scientific contributions to anatomy made in America. It had been made possible first by the magnificent collection of variations and anomalies of the bones of the hands and feet, probably the best of its kind in the world, which Professor Dwight had made for the Warren Museum of Harvard University during the quarter of a century while, with all the resources of the Harvard anatomical department at his command, he had taken special interest in the subject. Its value was, moreover, greatly enhanced by the many X-ray pictures of the extremities, and especially of the wrists and ankles, which had been made in difficult surgical cases at the Massachusetts General Hospital during the decade since the introduction of that very useful auxiliary to surgical diagnosis. These two sets of studies had shown the practical value of such knowledge and made it clear that even the supposedly rarer variations and anomalies were not infrequently involved in injuries of the hands and feet. In many a lesion called a sprain there was really a break of a bone or a dislocation not readily recognizable because the conditions present originally in the bones and the joints of these complex structures were not those usually set down as the normal

anatomy at the Harvard Medical School. (Philadelphia and London anatomy of the parts. On the other hand, many a suspected fracture was only an anomalous condition quite normal for the individual in question.

For those not familiar with the details of human anatomy it may be well to say that while men and women resemble one another quite closely in their structures, according to their respective sexes, this resemblance is not carried into details. There is no closer similarity of structure between any two individuals in any part of the body than there is in human faces. These are all different, in spite of some near resemblances, and most of them are quite strikingly and individually different. We make composite pictures which show what is the average normal type of face of certain races and peoples, but this does not necessarily resemble any individual very closely, and may depart from it very widely in certain features. Just in the same way the text-books of anatomy present what is the average plan of human structures, muscle and nerve and bone and their divisions, but probably any particular individual will deviate from this more or less in any given portion of his body. The more complex that human structures are, as in the neighborhood of the face, where the muscles of expression and the presence of the teeth and the eyes and the nose complicate the conditions of the tissues, the more likely is the individual anatomy to depart from the normal beneath the skin as well as on the surface. Just this same thing is true, though in a somewhat less degree, in the hands and feet, which are such intricate combinations of bone and soft tissue. Professor Dwight's book, then, on "*The Variations of the Bones of the Hands and Feet*," while appealing more particularly to the scientific anatomist, had a definite practical value, and was welcomed by careful, diligent surgeons as enabling them to explain many surgical conditions which had puzzled them before.

Probably the most interesting feature for me of the copy of the book as sent by its author was that it contained the well-known prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas, beginning "*Creator ineffabilis*," which so many Catholic scholars have used for centuries since St. Thomas' time at the commencement of any intellectual labor. It was not long after the reception of the book that I came to know at first hand how much its author thought of Aquinas, and how thoroughly he had devoted himself to the study of the great mediæval schoolman, whose combination of scientific information, obtained from his great investigating teacher, Albertus Magnus, with the philosophy of the Greeks, and especially of Aristotle, had enabled him to make a cosmic philosophy—I might rather say a

philosophy of the universe—that has probably never been equaled for its completeness or the thoroughness with which it responds to all the difficult problems of life.

At the moment, however, it seemed at least unusual that a distinguished scientific anatomist of the modern time should be so devout a disciple of the great mediæval schoolman. It was not alone that the oft-quoted maxim, more partial in its truth than most maxims, that where there are three physicians there are two atheists, would seem to negative such a combination, but, besides, there was the supposed skeptical effect of his specialty of anatomy. For he had been most interested in variations and anomalies in human anatomy, and these, because of the support they are at least claimed to furnish to the theory of evolution as applied to man's body as well as of that of the animals, are presumed by many scientific men of our time to have rendered faith in the great teachings of Christianity as regards creation quite impossible for scientific minds at least. It could scarcely fail to seem strange and almost impossible, then, to find a devout client of St. Thomas Aquinas in the person of the Parkman professor of anatomy at Harvard, one of the world's best authorities on variations and anomalies, and, with the exception of Professor Leidy, perhaps the most distinguished contributor to anatomical science that America has produced.

Before this I had known Professor Dwight from casual meetings at medical societies, but after this I had the privilege of a precious personal acquaintance with him and the pleasure of meeting him on a number of occasions, and of learning to know this chosen soul whose work in the medical sciences meant so much, yet whose simple-hearted devotion to Catholic practice made him noteworthy among his fellows. I had, besides, the valued honor of an introduction to his family circle, and of an acquaintance with those near and dear to him who shared so thoroughly in his faith. At a distance I was permitted, through his letters, to watch with compassionate interest how for more than two years he passed through the valley of the shadow of death with such unmoved Christian trustfulness that few of those who met him from day to day had any idea how seriously ill he was, though, being a physician, it could not be hidden from him, least of all by himself, that, at most, the inevitable fatal termination was but a few months off. Perhaps this much of acquaintance, beginning some twelve years ago, may justify my attempt to tell American Catholics something of the life of the man, a descendant of an old New England family, who in the breaking up of Protestantism found peace and consolation in the bosom of the old Church.

Thomas Dwight was the son of Thomas Dwight, of the old New England family of Dwight, and of Mary Collins (Warren) Dwight, granddaughter of John Warren, a brother of the General Warren who fell at Bunker Hill, and who, it will be recalled by those who still remember details of American history, was a physician. Together with his first cousin on his mother's side, Dr. John Collins Warren, a distinguished surgeon, Dr. Dwight represented the third generation by direct descent of an illustrious line of Boston physicians. He was born in Boston, October 13, 1843, and received his early education in Boston. He entered Harvard in the class of 1866, but did not complete the college course. In the meantime a very important factor had come into his life. When he was about twelve his mother became a convert to Catholicity, and he became a Catholic at the same time. How deep was his attachment to the Church which he thus entered as a growing boy all his after life attests.

He entered the Harvard Medical School in 1865, and received his degree of doctor of medicine in 1867. Our medical courses in America at that time are memorable mainly for their compendiousness. Dr. Dwight proceeded to enlarge his medical education by European study. Altogether, he spent two years abroad attending the regular surgical and medical clinics of Berlin, and particularly Vienna, but, in addition, he made special studies in anatomy for some months under Rüdinger at Munich. Rüdinger was attracting attention particularly by his study of the relations of human organs by means of sections of frozen bodies. As we shall see a little later, Dr. Dwight introduced this important method of anatomical study and teaching into America, and did some work on it that attracted attention and that has been referred to as a landmark in the history of this form of anatomical investigation.

On his return Dr. Dwight took up the practice of medicine in Boston and at Nahant, where he spent his summers for many years. He did not become deeply immersed in practice, however, and his tastes were rather for medical science than the practical art. It is not surprising, then, to find him in 1872 and 1873 the instructor in comparative anatomy at Harvard. In the meantime, however, he had devoted himself to rounding out what he thought defective in his preliminary education, and so we are told in 1872 of his receiving his degree of A. B. from Harvard. Serious study soon tells, and his work began to attract attention. In 1873 he was offered the chair of professor of anatomy at Bowdoin College, Maine. The instruction in the anatomical department of that institution was given intensively, and did not require his absence from Boston

except during a comparatively short time each year. He continued his connection with Harvard, occupying the position of instructor in histology.

During his earlier years of teaching at Harvard Professor Dwight kept in touch with the practical work of surgery, and doubtless his anatomical teaching benefited by this practical experience. There is always the danger that the theoretic scientist may become so much interested in science for its own sake that he forgets that he must teach young men whose principal interest in science is its practical applications. Nowhere is this more true than in the department of anatomy. Professor Dwight's surgical career, though brief, was, while it lasted, very active. He was visiting surgeon at the Carney Hospital from 1876 to 1883. He was surgeon to the outpatient department of the Boston City Hospital from 1877 to 1880. He was afterwards on the Board of Consultants of the Carney Hospital and for a time president of the staff. He realized, too, that his special anatomical knowledge might well be of interest to the public, and in 1884 he delivered a course of lectures at the Lowell Institute on "The Mechanism of Bone and Muscle," and in 1899 another course on "The Significance of Variations in the Human Body."

In 1883 he succeeded Oliver Wendell Holmes as professor of anatomy. The *Boston Transcript* just after Professor Dwight's death—and the *Transcript* is usually considered to voice Harvard University sentiment—said: "Dwight's election to the chair of anatomy at the Medical School was one of the most important in the history of that institution; it came just at the right time for him and for it." Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes had been an excellent teacher of anatomy, in spite of his own expression that his professorship had been a display of "incapacity, tempered with epigrams." He had so many other interests, however, that, though, in the words of a colleague, "no one could clothe the dry bones of anatomy with more interest," anatomical science as such was not pursued with the singleness of purpose and thoroughgoing devotion that it deserves and demands. "The appointment, then," to continue the quotation from the editorial in the *Transcript*, "really meant the transmission of the anatomical department to the dominance of a man possessed of thorough and accurate knowledge of his specialty and of quite unusual organizing talent. The Medical School felt soon enough that there was a new and firmer hand at that particular wheel." Dwight's work had already attracted wide attention, but now, from his prominent position, it came to be one of the stimulating factors in the pursuit of medical science in this country.

Dr. Dwight, then, had his professorship, his special anatomical

work and his life as a citizen of Boston before him for a quarter of a century. The world knows the story of his professorship through his students, who are medical teachers and practicing physicians all over the country. It knows what he accomplished in his anatomical rooms through his written work. His life as a practical Christian, deeply influencing those around him in his own generation, is largely hidden, except from those who were intimate with him. To know the man, however, one must have the more important details at least of the three phases of his life before one. It is this, though quite inadequately, mainly from lack of time, partly from lack of space, that I shall try to present here. I am sorry that the work has not fallen to some one who knew Professor Dwight better. Besides the advantage of personal acquaintance with him, however, I had the privilege of such help from his family and intimate friends as made it possible to gather many details not generally known. My admiration for the man may make up in some degree for the incompleteness of my knowledge of his life and work for a proper presentation of it to the public.

Professor Dwight's first important contribution to medical literature was made under the title "The Intracranial Circulation." So much in medicine depends on the circulation of blood through the brain that the importance of the subject can be readily realized. This paper won what is known as the Boylston prize in 1867—that is, the prize offered by the Boylston Medical Society, of Boston, each year for the best paper on a subject related to medicine sent in to the society under certain conditions. It was published by the Cambridge University Press the same year. The essays submitted for the competition have to be handed in without any name or means of identification attached to them other than a maxim, which is enclosed in a sealed envelope with the author's name within. The motto chosen by Dwight with characteristic modesty was a citation from Sir Thomas Brown's "Vulgar Errors:" "In this work attempts will exceed performances."

His next paper was a description of the whale in the collection of the Boston Society of Natural History, published in 1873. Then came his little volume on the anatomy of the head of the child, illustrated by frozen sections, published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. in 1872. ("Frozen Sections of a Child.")

This was a ground-breaking work in its line in America. It is, of course, of no interest to any one but those who are occupied with anatomical or surgical subjects. The professor of anatomy at St. Louis University Medical School, however, in his recent important work on serial sections calls attention to the fact that Professor

Dwight's study was the first of its kind made in this country, and eminently suggestive and valuable. It is typical of much of Professor Dwight's works. Practically always what he did was original, and he seldom took up the work of others with the idea of gaining easy prestige by slight additions of interest for the moment. This little book attracted much attention among anatomists and those who were interested in the study of children from a scientific standpoint.

An excursion into another field besides anatomy, though with eminent need of anatomical knowledge for its completion, was his essay on "The Identification of the Human Skeleton," a medico-legal study to which was awarded the prize of the Massachusetts Medical Society for 1878. It was published by Clapp in Boston this same year. Dwight made a number of interesting observations and collected a large amount of valuable material for the essay. He demonstrated by personal measurements of a number of specimens, very carefully made, that the long bones of the body were not always of exactly or nearly equal length on both sides. Sometimes the femur, the long bone of the thigh, was longer by half an inch in one leg than the corresponding bone of the other side. Sometimes this was made up for in the length of the leg by the presence of a shorter tibia, the main bone of the lower leg, on the same side, but occasionally both femur and tibia of one leg were markedly longer than those of the other. He found the same thing to be true for a number of other bones, and asymmetry rather than symmetry was the rule in most human skeletons when carefully studied. The practical importance of such observations for surgeons who have to set broken bones, and who must depend on measurements to guide them, can be readily appreciated. Besides the notable differences in the length of the bones of the legs were of help to understand individual peculiarities of gait and station.

After this his papers have less of popular, but much more of scientific interest. His paper on "The Sternum as an Index of Sex and Age" appeared in the *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology* for 1880. In 1894 Clapp published his Shattuck lecture on "The Range and Significance of Variation in Human Skeletons." More and more this came to be his special subject. In the *American Naturalist* for 1895 appeared his paper on "The Significance of Anomalies," and in the *Anatomische Anzeiger*, the well-known German anatomical journal, for the same year appeared his "Statistics of Variations, With Remarks on the Use of Such Data in Anthropology."

One of his colleagues who knew him best and who had followed his work closely summed up some of his scientific achievements in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* for September 21, 1911.

Perhaps what he accomplished may not seem much to those who are not familiar with the significance of his discoveries, not only for practical surgery, but for comparative anatomy. It is such detailed studies that enable us to control theoretic considerations and conclusions that seem to be indicated by a few observations, yet often are contradicted, or at least considerably modified, when an adequate number of observations can be made. Very little work like his has been done in America. We need more of this attention to detail which has been so characteristic of German medical research. Our modern biological sciences have been seriously hampered in their progress by jumping to conclusions of interesting theory that proved subsequently not to be justified by realities. We need an immense accumulation of data for this, and Dr. Dwight not only did his share nobly in beginning it, but the incentive that he provided will set many another investigator carefully at work. His biographer in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* said:

"Dr. Dwight took a special interest in the development of the anatomical part of the museum of the Medical School and in the use of its collection for research and teaching purposes. As a result of his efforts the anatomical collections were greatly extended and arranged on a very practical basis. He devoted much time to this work, especially in the last years of his life, and it was his hope to have been able to leave the collections so arranged as to show the normal anatomy and normal variations of all parts of the body. The work of the skeleton had been thoroughly done, and he had made progress with the vascular system and some of the organs when increasing weakness compelled him to stop. As a result of his labors the osteological collection is one of the best in existence, the normal variations of all the chief bones being beautifully shown. This is especially true of the collection of human spines, on which he spent much time and wrote several monographs. These illustrate practically all possible numerical variations in the various parts of the spine, and are practically unique. His collections of variations of the hand and foot deserve special mention. He discovered and described for the first time two cases of the presence of a new occasional bone—the intercuneiform bone in the foot—and the presence of the subcapitulum as a distinct bone in both hands. In the last two years of his life, when he knew he was suffering from a hopeless disease, it gave him great satisfaction to find and describe a specimen of a secondary cuboid bone in one foot, which had been seen only once before by any anatomist, and shortly after a similar case of the same bone occurring in both feet at the same time—an absolutely unique case. These two monographs, together with another on

variations of the first rib and costal elements of the neck, represent his last contributions to anatomical literature. He also made a very fine series of corrosion preparations of various kinds for the museum."

Professor Dwight's collection of bones to illustrate variations and anomalies, as it may be seen in the Warren Museum of Anatomy in the new buildings at Harvard, is most interesting even for those not especially addicted to anatomy. Physicians are well aware of the great variety of anomalies that have been found, but few of them realize how frequent these are and how widely some of them depart from what is called the normal condition that is the most frequent morphologic status of the part. There are a series illustrating nearly every form of diversion from the average condition. A typical illustration, taken almost at random, will suffice to represent what will be found there. In the upper part of the scapula, the bone popularly known as the shoulder blade, there is usually found a groove for the passage of the nerve to the group of rather important muscles that move this bone. This groove is sometimes rather shallow, sometimes it is quite deep, sometimes its edges approach so close together above the deep groove as to constitute almost a hole, or foramen, as it is technically called. Sometimes it is a complete foramen that permits the passage of the nerve. This state is found in certain animals normally. Sometimes nature, apparently forgetting that she has already made a foramen for the passage of the nerve, makes a groove above it, so that there is both a foramen and a groove, though the nerve passes through the foramen as a rule. In Professor Dwight's collection are to be found scapulæ representing all these conditions, from a shallow to a deep groove, and then a groove that is almost a foramen; finally a foramen, and then both groove and foramen in the same specimen.

It would be very easy, of course, to conclude that very little of practical value for medicine could be derived from such detailed studies of anomalous conditions. Anomalies are rather rare events, and there are so many of them that it would be very difficult to know them all, and the physician and surgeon must depend on his knowledge of the normal average man and cannot be expected to be familiar with peculiar conditions special to a very few individuals. Professor Dwight in the preface to his book on "Variations of the Bones of the Hands and Feet" has answered this very simply and effectively, and has called attention to the fact, of course, that it is exactly the careful expert individualization of treatment that constitutes the real success of the physician or surgeon. The practitioner of medicine is not called to treat an average human being, but a

definite individual with whatever peculiarities that may be present. We know now, of course, that progress in medicine consists just in this individualization. We do not treat typhoid fever nor pneumonia, but particular individuals suffering from these diseases. Each case is a special problem by itself, requiring special study. Just in the same way surgical conditions of the hands and feet require such special study, and to assume that it is an average normal individual who is under treatment is to ignore the knowledge of special peculiarities and their significance in such conditions as they have come to be known in recent years.

Professor Dwight said: "The constantly increasing use of the X-ray has shown that the study of variations is not a scientific fad, but a matter of very great practical importance. Not only are the ordinary variations (still but little known to the surgeon) constantly appearing, but very uncommon ones are occasionally seen. In fact, the number of hands and feet examined by the X-ray is so much greater than that of those seen *post-mortem* by anatomists that it is not surprising that variations thought excessively rare should repeatedly be brought to light.

"For many years I have devoted myself to the study of variations in man, especially to those of the spine and of the bones of the hand and foot. The importance of these in the practice of surgery becomes clearer day by day. This atlas has been prepared for the use of the practitioner. Some variations are discussed which are of interest to the orthopædist, but attention has been given chiefly to those which may be expected to appear in skiagraphs taken after an injury, and which may suggest a fracture to the unwary."

Something of the meaning of these detailed investigations into variations of the bones of the hands and feet may be gathered from even a slight consideration of the bones of the wrist and the variants in number and form that are found in particular individuals. The wrist is said normally to consist of eight bones. At least double this number, however, have been found in various subjects, if the possibilities of division and separation among these through embryonic disturbances are taken into account. The larger bones may occur in two parts, and some of their processes may remain separated quite apart from injury, or may not have grown together originally, and as a consequence when some injury happens later in life the X-rays may show a condition quite different to the average normal, and yet perfectly normal for that individual. All these possibilities need to be known by the surgeon in these cases to prevent him from thinking a special form of fracture has occurred or that processes of healing are not taking place because he finds separation between bones where

ordinarily such separations do not occur. It is probably that Professor Dwight's atlas of these variations and anomalies has been of the greatest practical help to surgeons since the introduction of the X-rays made possible the more careful study of conditions.

Such studies, of course, can only be pursued by the specialists, and even then only by one who has ample facilities for travel, opportunities for study and such recognition as enables him to devote himself to his task wherever he wishes. In the study of variations in bones, for instance, for the determination of a single point, which he discusses in his paper, "The Significance of the Third Trochanter and of Similar Bony Processes in Man," published in the *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology*, Volume XXIV., 1889, Professor Dwight examined skeletons at the Army Medical Museum, International Museum at Washington, at the Hunterian Museum in London, besides the collections close at hand in Peabody Museum, Harvard. In his investigations he examined both thigh bones of seventy-four skeletons from the Tennessee Stone Graves, making his researches represent the distant past as well as more recent times.

A time came when these patient, profound studies were to bear fruit, both from the scientific and the practical point of view. Professor Dwight came to be looked upon as one of the world authorities on variations and anomalies. This subject had attained a place of importance in biology because of the arguments which seemed to provide for the explanation of such phenomena as reversion to the animal types through which man in his descent had passed—it was so easy to use the word reversion whenever an anomalous condition in man could be found in animals, and there was little thought of the necessity for studying out carefully such relations from a scientific standpoint. Professor Dwight did this, and his conclusions were quite at variance with those reached by hasty students, who, knowing little about the subject, were, as is usually the case, ready to draw all the wider conclusions. To him the reversion principle seemed a contradiction of many obvious scientific observations. He wrote a series of papers on this subject, and when, at the end of his life, he wrote his last testament of scientific opinion in his "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist," he summed up much of what he had written for the benefit of non-technical readers, who would not be likely to have seen his conclusions and the reasons for them in the special scientific journals in which they had been published. Because of its place in biology in the question of evolution this subject came to be one of the most important in biological science, and Professor Dwight's long and patient studies made him one of the greatest authorities in it.

As he said himself: "The more anomalies we study, the less justification do we find for explaining them as reversions." Only the specialists, or at least one thoroughly familiar with the subject, can always appreciate the significance of such investigations, though nearly always even the rank outsider can catch the drift of the argument and, above all, realize how carefully the investigation has been made. A typical example that will illustrate this is to be found in Professor Dwight's discussion of the distinction between the bony skeleton of the lower portion of the nose in animals and in man. He has himself in his last book ("Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist") boiled down the paper on the "Fossa Prænasilis," published originally in the *American Journal of Medical Sciences*, February, 1892, so I prefer to quote it directly:

"The border at the lower opening of the cavity of the nose is usually in the human skull a sharp little ridge. In animals the lower border is, as a rule, rounded off, so that there is no sharp distinction between the inside of the nose and the front of the face. Occasionally in low human skulls this condition is found, and it is not absurd to call it a reversion; but very rarely there exists just below the entrance of the nose a little pit with sharply marked borders entirely different from the gutter-like form, called the fossa prænasalis. I have sought for this feature very carefully among the skulls of mammals without success, except in the seal tribe. There I have found it variously developed, and sometimes very well marked, notably in the harp seal, but I have not been able to study a large enough series to be sure that it is quite constant. I incline strongly, however, to believe that it may be said to be normal in this aberrant family of the carnivora. Will some one kindly tell me how man has reverted to the seal?"

Professor Dwight's opinion, thus emphatically expressed, is in contradiction to much of what was said with regard to variations and anomalies when these features of the human body were assumed to be so many evidences of the evolution of man from the animal. Whenever a structure was found that could, even by any stretch of the imagination, be presumed to be similar to a structure peculiar to an animal, this was assumed to be another argument in favor of the descent of man from animal species. Whenever the arrangement of human structures was anomalous in particular individuals, so that they recalled in any way the special arrangement of animal structures, this was proclaimed another proof of human descent. Professor Dwight, after all his careful studies on the subject, declares that while at first view variations and anomalies might seem to justify such a conclusion, deeper study and wider knowledge shows

very clearly that they do not. This is exactly what has happened with regard to other phases of the argument and evidences for human descent that have been urged with no little insistence during the last generation. We are now coming to realize that while superficial knowledge with regard to them made it apparent that they were proofs, or at least furnished evidence for descent, deeper knowledge has completely changed our view with regard to them.

A typical example, of course, is to be found in what concerns so-called useless organs in the human body. These were set down as vestigial remains of animal structures which were still maintained in the human body, though there were no longer any use for them, because they had existed in the previous stages of development and natural selection had not succeeded in obliterating them, though their obliteration is only a matter of time. It is curiously interesting now to go back and see how many structures were set down as useless even as late as 1880. The function of the spleen is unknown, and as it could be removed without killing the patient, even it was among the useless organs. Then there were the tonsils, various gland systems, the thyroid, the hypophysis cerebri and other structures. There are a very few of these that are now considered to be useless. Even the appendix, supposed to be the most irrefutable evidence of this kind, is no longer considered useless. It has a definite function, and while, like the spleen, it may be removed without killing the patient, it is probably much better for the generality of men that they have their appendixes. Anatomy and physiology have brought us to the very opposite extreme, and now we know that most organs in the human body have not only their manifest function, but often secondary functions, sometimes two or three in number, that are of great importance. The internal secretions of organs that have definite ducts are often more important than the secretion that passes through the duct. The ductless glands, formerly considered useless organs because our superficial acquaintance with them did not enable us to know much about them, are now counted among the most important structures in the body.

It is not surprising, then, that Professor Dwight should have found the same state of affairs with regard to variations and anomalies. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing even, or perhaps especially, in biology. It is dangerous in philosophy because it tempts people to draw conclusions that are not justified by wider knowledge. Biology is only the philosophy of life, and here once more the superficial knowledge leads astray. This has been quite as true in other phases of the Darwinian argument, as, for instance, with regard to so-called protective mimicry. Some natural selection

of animals, so as to make them assimilate to their surroundings for protective purposes there is, but the attempt to explain color generally in nature in this way has broken down completely. We have had some most amusing examples of how men permitted themselves to be led astray in this matter. With the significance of variations and anomalies gone, that of useless organs seriously diminished and that of protective mimicry rendered ridiculous in many respects, most of the arguments on which the acceptance of the theory of descent through natural selection is founded for the great majority of people have disappeared.

Professor Dwight does not refuse entirely to accept the theory of evolution, but he insists that as yet we have very little, indeed almost no definite evidence, though the tyranny of the *Zeitgeist*—of the spirit of the time—is such that most men give much more credence to it than is justified by the evidence afforded them. He quotes Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan, who said :

“But I venture to prophesy that if any one will undertake to question modern zoölogists and botanists concerning their relation to the Darwinian theory, he will find that, while professing in a general way to hold this theory, most biologists have many reservations and doubts, which they either keep to themselves or, at any rate, do not allow to interfere with the teaching of the Darwinian doctrine or with the applications which they make of it in their writings. The claim of the opponents of the theory that Darwinism has become a dogma contains more truth than the nominal followers of the school find pleasant to hear.”

Professor Dwight goes to the heart of the subject in a single rather long paragraph that deserves to be quoted in its entirety, because it sums up a distinguished present-day scientist's views with regard to the evidence for and against Darwinism (p. 44) :

“Beyond question, just at the time when the uneducated are prating about the triumph of Darwinism, it is fast losing caste among men of science. After all, what has ever been established? What evidence have we of the gradual passing of one species into another? What has become of the intermediate forms, not indeed of those between any two given species, but of those between the hosts of species which must have in turn risen from lower and given origin to higher ones? Rudimentary and useless structures have been one of the strong points of Darwinism, but what do they show? First, that there are certain strong resemblances, dependent on unity of plan, between different species, indeed different orders and even different classes of animals ; second, that there are, beyond any question, structures that are useless to the individual. Formerly these

were quoted as inheritances, degenerate representatives of structures of past usefulness, and in many cases this may be true. But Osborn tells us that his paleontological studies show that rudimentary structures—horns, for instance—appear in species which could not have inherited them, but which are themselves the ancestors of those who are to show these same structures in greater development. Nothing could be more fatal than this not only to Darwinism, but to any system of purposeless evolution. Hybrids are as sterile as they ever were. New species have failed to materialize. Artificial variations (unless fixed by the crossing of Mendel's 'dominants' with dominants, or of 'regressives' with regressives, of which Darwin knew nothing) still tend to revert to original conditions. Sexual selection, the theory according to which the best equipped males carry off females from their inferior neighbors, has not proved its claims. It is not certain that surviving species are always the best adapted to their surroundings. The theory has been most productive of loose reasoning. Morgan, referring to the Darwinian school, says very justly: 'To imagine that a certain organ is useful to its possessor, and to account for its origin because of the imagined benefit conferred, is the general procedure of the followers of this school' (p. 453). It has given rise, however, to worse than loose reasoning, for conclusions destructive of all morality, founded on quite imaginary premises, have been offered to the unwary."

Professor Dwight has pointed out the weakness of other systems of evolution quite as strikingly as Darwinism. "Upon Weismann's principle," he quotes Professor Osborn as saying: "We can explain inheritance, but not evolution, while with Lamarck's principle and Darwin's selection principle we can explain evolution, but not at present inheritance." Unless a theory of evolution can explain both evolution and inheritance, it cannot be scientifically accepted. Professor Dwight has something to say positively for evolution, though he considers that he can say that best in quotations from a distinguished Catholic priest—a Jesuit scientist—whose work in one department of biology has attracted wide attention, and who has won for himself the right to be heard on this subject. Professor Dwight says (p. 54):

"The opinion of Rev. Eric Wasmann, S. J., whose studies on ants, wasps and bees have placed him high among scientists, is well worth quoting in this connection. He is convinced that the doctrine of evolution is not at variance with the Christian theory of life, and in no other way can he account for certain facts. The interest of the following quotation must be the excuse for its length:

"I wish to draw your attention to the fact that accommodation to

the life of ants and white ants, or termites, has in all probability led to the formation of new *species*, *genera* and *families* among their guests, which belong to very various families and orders of insects. In many cases (*Thaumatoxena*) the characteristic marks have been so completely altered by accommodation that it is scarcely possible for us to determine to which order of insects this strange creature belongs. In other cases (*Termitomyia*) the whole development of the individual is modified in such a way that it resembles that of a viviparous mammal rather than that of a fly. The oft-repeated assertion of the upholders of the theory of permanence, that variation by way of accommodation only produces abnormal forms within the species, is thus seen to be false.

“‘What conclusions are we to draw from these considerations? If we carefully study the phenomena which have just been presented to us, we must acknowledge that only the theory of evolution can explain to us how these interesting forms came into being. We cannot supply a scientific explanation by merely declaring that these strange little creatures—such, for instance, as the Mirmeciton or ant-ape—were created by God expressly for this or that variety of ant. *The principle of the theory of evolution is the only one which supplies us with a natural explanation of these phenomena*, and therefore we accept it. But to what extent are we to accept it? *Just as far as its application is supported by actual proofs.*’

“Surely this is the language of sane science. What a contrast to Weismann’s!

“Moreover, though recognizing the interior causes of evolution as the essential ones, he (Fr. Wasmann) would not totally reject Darwinism. ‘My own experience,’ he says (p. 42), ‘gained in the course of my research work in my special department, shows natural selection to be indispensable as a subsidiary factor, but only a factor—the *interior causes of evolution* remain always the chief points to consider, for they produce the beneficial modifications, and so are of greater importance than external circumstances, for these only eliminate the modifications which are not beneficial in the struggle for existence.’ In view of this acceptance of evolution, Father Wasmann’s conclusions are the most important, and, at the risk of over-quotation, deserve to be given in his own words: ‘But the higher we ascend in the systematic categories and the more closely we approach the great chief types of the animal world, the scantier becomes the evidence; in fact, it fails so completely that we are finally forced to acknowledge that *the assumption of a monophyletic evolution of the whole kingdom of organic life is a delightful dream without any scientific support.*’

"He further endorses Fleischmann's assertion that it is impossible to trace back the chief types of the animal kingdom to one primitive form.

"This, indeed," says Dwight, "is, in my humble opinion, the conclusion to which the great majority of naturalists would subscribe were they driven into a corner and called upon to tell the truth without 'ifs' or 'buts.'"

In discussing the supposed evolution of man Professor Dwight has particularly emphasized the necessity for considering how much is the possibility of degeneration in the human race. Our ordinary ideas of evolution would seem to imply constant progress upwards in rational creatures particularly, but it is well known that such progress does not take place. On the contrary, lofty attainment is often followed by decadence in a nation, and people sink to almost unbelievable levels of degradation. Our statistics of illiteracy in this country, for instance, show that a great many native-born inhabitants whose ancestors have been here for generations must be counted among the illiterates. In the mountain regions of certain parts of the country deterioration to a remarkable degree has taken place. Not only is interest lost in the intellectual life, but moral ideas come into abeyance, and all the better side of man sinks very low. Professor Dwight touches on this (p. 169):

"There is another view of this whole question which deserves respectful consideration, though it is so at variance with the influence of the *Zeitgeist* that little is heard of it. May it not be that many low forms of man, archaic as well as contemporary, are degenerate races? We are told everything, and more than everything, about progress, but decline is put aside. It is impossible to construct a tolerable scheme of ascent among the races of man, but cannot dark points be made light by this theory of degeneration? One of the most obscure, and to me most attractive, of questions is the wiping out of old civilizations. That it has occurred repeatedly and on very extensive scales is as certain as any fact in history. Why is it not reasonable to believe that bodily degeneration took place in those fallen from a higher estate, who, half starved and degraded, returned to savagery? Moreover, the workings of the soul would be hampered by the degenerating brain. For my part, I believe the Neanderthal man to be a specimen of a race not arrested in its upward climb, but thrown down from a higher position. We have been told, I believe by Max Muller, that there are few, if any, of the most degraded races of mankind whose language does not suggest a larger vocabulary than the one now in use. Herbert Spencer speaks in his 'Sociology' of the degradation from something higher of most,

if not of all, the savage tribes of to-day. None the less there is the great objection to this view, the importance of which must not be denied, that the Neanderthal race was an excessively old one, and that skeletons of the higher race, which, according to the view I have offered, must have existed at the same time as the degenerate ones, are still to be discovered."

Such degeneracy as occurs is often not a mere sinking back into animal brutishness, the very form of the phrase that we use apparently supposing our acceptance of an upward progress from the brute, but is a corruption of what is best in us, becoming, in the words of the Roman poet, Publius Syrus, what is worst, *corruptio optimi pessima*. Men actually seem to get into a sort of reactionary state, in which they break all bounds and fairly rejoice in what is worst. The expression that life would scarcely be worth living if the worst that could be had been done, so that there is an ambition to outdo others in ill doing which becomes typical of these decadents. Professor Dwight, in finishing his chapter on "Man," has put this simply and suggestively, without painting a harrowing picture, though there was chance for it, because he wishes not to appeal to the emotions, but to the intellect (p. 178) :

"There is another allied aspect of fallen man which must at least be glanced at, dark and repulsive as it is. Let any one consider the refinement of vice in the cruelty, lust and luxury of the Roman Empire and of Oriental despotisms (for very shame's sake we shall look no nearer home), and he will find in it a malice very different from mere savagery. The cause lies deeper than in the survival of animal passions; it is far more suggestive of a fallen angel reveling in evil. It is not the return to a lower state, but the corruption of a higher. Chesterton says truly: 'Man is always something worse or something better than an animal.'"

In the midst of the busy work and study and wide reading that made it possible for Professor Dwight to speak with authority on such subjects, there came the warning that the end was not far off. On July 14, 1910, he wrote to a very dear friend who had been his confessor years before as follows:

"Nahant, July 9, 1910.

"It was a great pleasure to receive your note, and I answer it at once. Both the rumors you heard about me are true in a degree, but the former is the truest. I had had a disquieting attack three years ago, and last summer I had a renewal of it in my bowels. To make it short, early last August they operated on me and found cancer of the intestines. The surgeon did only a temporary operation; that is, he made no attempt to remove the cancer, and made a permanent

opening. I have to wear an apparatus and have an attendant, for all my movements come through this opening. Somehow life is a great deal more tolerable than you would imagine possible. I did a decent amount of work at the Medical School. They have behaved very handsomely to me. I have offered my resignation twice, but they tell me to go on as long as I feel able to do my teaching. Of course, I have had to cut down on scientific work. The cancer is a slow-growing thing, and I look forward to getting through one more winter's work. I eat and sleep fairly well, and have little pain. The discomfort and annoyances are indescribable and disgusting, but somehow God gives me grace to bear them. I want to resign from the St. Vincent de Paul, but the Archbishop will not let me. So much for me. Please pray that I may have the grace of perseverance.

"I really am at a loss to understand why you should make so much of my having gone to see you at the hospital. In view of what you have done for me, I could hardly do less. Please pray for us all; you see there is plenty of need."

A month later he wrote:

"Nahant, August 5, 1910.

"I must write you a line to thank you for your very kind letter, which it was a great pleasure to receive. I want to thank you above all for your great kindness in remembering me in your daily Mass. It is a great blessing for me. I am surprised at the number of people who are praying for me, and I humbly trust that they will obtain for me the grace of final perseverance and of a happy death. Since the operation (within two days of a year ago), when I learned what was the matter, I have never prayed for recovery, but only to die well, and, if it may be, to work a little longer. The doctor was here about a month ago, and spoke of trying serum treatment to *cure* me. I have heard nothing more of it, and imagine he proposes to begin (if I let him) when I am in town. I do not think I should consent if it is likely to break me up and spoil my work. After all, I am nearly sixty-seven. I remember a year or two ago that once after dinner with my medical club they began talking about a man who had died at sixty-eight, and began to find causes for his death. I remarked (and, as I was the youngest, they may not quite have liked it) that when a man died at sixty-eight he had lived his life, and could not complain of being cut off in his prime. Now it is *de me fabula*.

"I trust you yourself are pretty well. Let me thank you once more and beg you not to forget me."

It was while thus bravely, peacefully, calmly facing death, yet

doing his work and gathering up the scattered ends, so that as far as possible his work might be complete, that Professor Dwight finished his book, "The Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist." He had worked at it several times and then put it aside rather modestly, feeling that some one probably might be able to do it better and distrusting his own ability. Now that the end was approaching, he took it up and completed it, leaving it as a legacy of his thought to his generation. Probably no book on evolution has been completed under more solemn circumstances than this. They were literally his last words to his generation, said with consciousness that death was approaching. Statements made under such circumstances are accepted in every court of law in the world as representing absolutely the individual's most conscientious thought, as it were, in the face of God. Such Professor Dwight's book must be taken to be, and the conditions of its writing give a new seriousness to his thoughts and a deeper significance to the conclusions that he reaches. It is written in his modest but kindly way, and while with regard to two men of his generation he uses rather strong expressions, these can readily be seen to be necessitated by the circumstances.

In the preface he said:

"If I be not mistaken, there is more or less curiosity on the part of those outside of the Church to know what Catholics of education, especially those who themselves have worked in science, think in their own hearts of the dogmas of the Church on the one hand and of the assertions of modern science on the other. Are not Catholics guilty of dishonesty in appearing to subscribe to beliefs which they do not sincerely hold, and which fail to accord with what is accepted by the public as science? The suspicion is perhaps not unnatural, especially on the part of those whose ideas of Catholics are distorted by the misrepresentations of centuries. It may be, too, that this suspicion is somewhat strengthened by the very natural unwillingness of men to wear their hearts upon their sleeves, to tell their most secret and solemn thoughts in the market-place.

"It is often said by those outside of the Church that they cannot see how a Catholic can be a man of science, and, conversely, how a man of science can be a Catholic. Indeed, I fear there are many poorly instructed Catholics who are very much of the same opinion. It may be that it is my duty, on account of the position I have the honor to hold, to give to both of these classes such poor help as I can. It is many years since I began this book, which I have thrown aside again and again. Apart from the difficulty of finding time for the work, it seemed impossible to do it to my own satisfaction and to say anything which has not been better said. While I fear that

the last objection still holds good, yet I hope that this little book may fall into hands which have not held the better ones. It is just possible that some of those who have been my pupils during the twenty-seven years of my professorship may be interested in the views as mine. Should that be the case, I am sure that I need not tell them that this discussion is meant, above all, to be an honest one.

"The book bears the imprimatur of the Church. The nature of some of the topics discussed made it my bounden duty to apply for it, but I should have done so in any case, that there might be no question as to the orthodoxy of any of my statements."

Those who would know the details of Professor Dwight's attitude toward faith and science must follow him in that book, though I have given in the course of this article a number of quotations that will serve to show the drift of his thinking. One or two other phases of his thought which illustrate his position on such important problems as vitalism—the existence of a principle of life apart from the ordinary forces of matter—and with regard to regeneration, the study of which has told more against natural selection as an important factor in evolution than any other recent studies, deserve to be further dwelt on.

The most important phase of biological knowledge in recent times has been the study of regeneration or repair in living tissues. The more careful studies are made on this subject the less room is left for any thought of animals as mere machines, or as collections of cells more or less independent of each other, and the more clear does it become that there is a coördination of all the portions of the organism for the benefit of the whole and an orderly directing of the various cells to all the purposes that maintain the life and preserve the integrity of the being to which they belong. For this Professor Dwight has quoted from Driesch's Gifford lectures a passage which shows how strongly arguments drawn from this source have influenced modern biology. Driesch, who is the professor of biology at Heidelberg, a student of Haeckel's in his early career, has come to see the utter absurdity of mere materialism in biology and of the assertion that living bodies are machines. Driesch says:

"Now, you may ask yourselves if you could imagine any sort of a machine, which consists of many parts, but not even of an absolutely fixed number, all of which are equal in their faculties, but all of which in each single case, in spite of their potential equality, not only produce together a certain totality, but also arrange themselves typically *in order* to produce this totality. We *are* indeed familiar with certain occurrences in nature where such curious facts are observed, but I doubt if you would speak of them as 'machines' in

these cases. The mesenchyma cells, in fact, behave just as a number of workmen would do who are to construct, say, a bridge. All of them *can* do every single act, all of them *can* assume every single position; the result always is to be a perfect bridge, even if some of the workmen become sick or are killed by an accident. The 'prospective values' of a single workman change in such a case."

On this Professor Dwight has a comment that adds much to the force of the argument, and his carrying out of the figure of the bridge shows how strong is the present biological position in favor of vitalism—that is, of an independent principle of life that governs and rules the whole organism for the benefit of the whole, using the various powers and capacities of the portions of the organism not merely for themselves, but also for the benefit of the being to which they all belong:

"That is to say, that if certain cells are injured, their places can be taken by others quasi-intelligently and doing other than the work which would naturally have fallen to them. But Driesch might have gone further and have supposed that some accident had happened to the bridge in the course of construction, and have told us that then these same cells would have rearranged themselves and have made, if not the contemplated bridge, at least a very tolerable substitute for one. Instances might easily be cited of the behavior of the bony tissue after a fracture, say, of the neck of the femur, in which the architectural design is repaired with adaptation to the new conditions. Surely this is more than the work of a machine, but, what is at this moment more to the point, it is more than the work of a very large number of cells. Even if we yield ourselves to the absurdity of calling the cells intelligent, we must admit that this is not enough. Let us suppose such an accident happening to an actual bridge with an army of workmen upon and about it. How in the world will they start without consultation to repair it? Who will decide what is the proper plan to adopt? Who will tell each man what to do? It takes little imagination to see that without a leader the result will be fatal and hopeless confusion. If a leading spirit would be necessary for men, how much more so for cells? Now, this guiding power cannot be material, for it pervades the whole. This it is that presides over development, growth, repair. In the mineral kingdom we find one set of phenomena which resembles these shown in the process of repair in the living. It is manifested in crystals in process of formation which, when injured, are not only repaired, but repaired in more than one way, according to circumstances. The analogy with vital processes is very striking, but, after all, it applies to but one of the manifestations of life."

Sometimes the extent to which the directing power of the principle of life will go for the benefit of the organism is very striking. In processes of repair, when the original tissues cannot be replaced, and when even the original functions cannot be exercised, sometimes other functions are made to replace them so as to benefit the organism as far as possible. The case that is cited by Professor Dwight is particularly striking in this regard, and amply justifies his emphatic conclusion (p. 133):

"Some experiments by Herbst have shown a wonderful provision (so to speak) for the good of the whole by the adoption on the part of the organism of different methods of repair according to the injury. Thus, if both the eye and the optic ganglion be removed from the crayfish, no new eye appears; but if the ganglion be left, an eye is reproduced. This is certainly sufficiently wonderful, but it is far short of the whole truth. If both the eye and the ganglion be removed, an antenna arises in their place. In short, it being impossible to restore sight, an organ of touch makes what amends it can for the want of the eye. It seems to me that this observation alone is fatal to any materialistic conception of the living organism."

IN THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY for July, 1892, Professor Dwight had an article on "Matter and Form in Biology," in which he brought out the fact that the old scholastic way of looking at living things and considering that they had a principle of life called a form in mediæval philosophy was a helpful point of view even for the modern time. In that article he discusses various anomalies and variations, as well as monstrosities among human beings in their relation to the principle of life. At that time, twenty years ago, the mechanists—that is, the observers in biology who explained all the manifestations of life on mechanical principles—were very prominent. Macallister, the British anatomist; Professor Cope, the American zoölogist, and Professor Wilhelm Roux, the German embryologist, were the most prominent. Professor Dwight has discussed the principle taken by each living thing and pointed out that there is always something more than environment and mechanical factors to be considered. Among other phases of the subject, he discusses the specimen of the left arm bearing seven fingers which was in the museum of the Harvard Medical School. Matter alone, without a directing form, could not have developed in this way, though this is only a striking exemplification, and the formation of the normal limb can only be explained in the same way. Professor Dwight says (p. 462):

"Other and, perhaps, more puzzling cases might be mentioned. Nothing is further from our thought than to imply that the system

of matter and form makes clear even the simplest of the problems we have before us. The point we wish to emphasize is that, though not clear to our imagination, this system is satisfactory to reason. There is no conflict between it and the observation of physical science. It shows that life is the result of an immanent force. External forces (counting as such the physical properties even of internal parts of the organism) can and do modify, but cannot originate. That the mode of action of the form is beyond us is not a defect of the system, but the consequence of our limited powers. After all, what process of physical forces, even in non-living bodies, can we claim to truly know and understand?"

A typical example of Professor Dwight's use of his knowledge of the whole round of medical sciences, in order to illustrate the necessity for accepting the existence of a principle of life, may be found, as it seems to me, in the following paragraphs from his last book. As he has said himself, he has tried to put it in language that would be easily understood by those who are not anatomists, and I think any one who reads it will confess that he has succeeded admirably in doing so (p. 141):

"The following instance, also from human anatomy, is a more striking one. I shall try to make it intelligible to those who are not anatomists. The pneumogastric is a great nerve extending from the base of the skull through the neck down into the thorax, in the upper part of which the right one passes in front of the subclavian artery, which is an important vessel arching over the lung near its apex and passing out under the collar-bone to supply the right arm with blood. As the nerve passes this artery it gives off a branch, the recurrent laryngeal nerve (so called from its course), which, hooking under the vessel, passes backwards and then upwards to the larynx, the organ of voice, in which it supplies most of the muscles of the right side. Now, it seems surprising that as the pneumogastric passed directly beside the larynx in its descent the branch is not given off at the level of the larynx, instead of having to take this retrograde course. The answer is that in the early stages of the embryo the heart is situated very much higher than later (in fact, it is very near to the head), and that the nerve, in fact, passed to the larynx below the arterial arch, which later forms the right subclavian. As the heart descends to its permanent place the arches descend with it, and the nerve is drawn down by the arch, so that to reach its destination it has to travel upward. This is the usual explanation, and there is no doubt that it is the true one, for in certain cases in which the right subclavian artery develops in an abnormal manner, so that the arch is not formed across the laryngeal nerve, the latter passes directly by the shortest way from its parent

trunk to the larynx. This seems conclusively that normally the nerve is pulled down. But note what happens in the adult when a swelling of the subclavian artery (aneurism) presses on the recurrent nerve as it passes under it. The nerve is disorganized by the pressure, so that paralysis of the muscles supplied by it is the result. Now, the displacement of the nerve by this swelling is insignificant compared to that resulting from the change of position during development. Moreover, in the adult the nerve is protected by fibrous tissue, while in the early embryo it is little more than a chain of cells, yet they resist the strain. This pulling down of the nerve is confirmed by the fact that it takes another course when there is no strain upon it, while under usual circumstances it allows itself to be dragged. The only explanation conceivable is that the delicate cells of the developing nerve yield, as it were, willingly to the pull of the artery, while in the adult they perish under the pressure of an abnormal swelling."

Probably Dr. Dwight's most striking points in this book are made in the chapter on "Living and Non-Living," in which he has placed under contribution not only the writings of others, but his own extensive observation on anatomy. He had specially emphasized the power of the living organism to repair itself and the capacity manifested to make these repairs in such a way as will at once best overcome the injury, yet, as a rule, preserve the function of the part. Occasionally it is impossible for the organic structures to be put in their former condition, and then the repairs are made in such a way as will be most conducive to the restoration of function. As Dr. Dwight puts it:

"Yet what is most extraordinary is that efforts are made by the organism to carry on an interrupted function by appropriate changes in the apparatus. Let the artery of a limb be tied so that the supply of blood is cut off; the branches above and below the ligature enlarge so that what is called the collateral circulation is established. Some one may say that of course they enlarge by the increased pressure of the blood behind them, due to the cutting off of the direct supply, but what is noteworthy is that the arterial branches below the interruption enlarge also, so that there is an obvious effort to reestablish the circulation of the limb. Instead of this occurring, one would think it more simple for the arterial blood to go back to the heart as quickly as possible by the enlargement of the capillaries and veins above the injury, thus leaving the limb to its fate. But that is not what happens; there is something providing for the welfare of the whole."

Professor Dwight's familiarity with the general literature of the biological sciences enables him often to quote striking passages, and

the accumulation of a number of these makes his book very effective. Probably none of his quotations is more apt than that with which he closes his chapter on "Design and Plan." I prefer, for obvious reasons, to give his own introduction to the quotation and concluding comment (p. 115):

"I have been deeply impressed by some remarks of the late Marquis of Salisbury at the Oxford meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1894. They cannot have been pleasing to many of those who heard them, but yet, so far as I know, they have never been answered. In fact, it was one of those attacks which can only be ignored; silence was the only resource of his adversaries. 'Professor Mendelyeev,' he said, 'has shown that the perplexing list of elements can be divided into families of about seven, speaking very roughly; that all these families resemble each other in this, that as to weight, volume, heat and laws of combination the members of each family are ranked among themselves in obedience to the same rule. Each family differs from the others, but each is internally constructed upon the same plan.'

"'What was weakness in this theory was turned into strength,' to quote again his words, 'by the discovery of certain elements which were wanting in some of the groups when the law was first announced. The discovery of these coördinate families dimly points to some identical origin, without suggesting the nature of their genesis or the nature of their common parentage. If they were organic beings, all our difficulties would be solved by muttering the comfortable word "evolution"—one of those indefinite words, from time to time vouchsafed to humanity, which has the gift of alleviating so many perplexities and masking so many gaps in our knowledge. But the families of elementary atoms do not breed, and we cannot therefore ascribe their ordered difference to accidental variations perpetuated by heredity under the influence of natural selection.'

"Thus we see curious arrangements in inorganic nature distinctly proclaiming law and order, which cannot be explained away by the slang which in biology is allowed to pass for argument. If, then, there be law and order in the lifeless which can be accounted for only by assuming an intelligent Creator (for the doctrine of blundering chance is really beneath contempt), why, in the name of reason, are they to be excluded from the realm of the living?"

With Professor Dwight's interest in biological science thus illustrated, his faith becomes of special interest because of the impression which prevails so commonly that a profound knowledge of science, and especially of modern science, is almost incompatible with deep, firm faith. It matters not how often the opposite of this is illus-

trated in the lives of distinguished Catholic scientists, the impression still continues. It is easy to understand why, without at all wishing to either be controversial or to say what might seem harsh, that faith in Protestantism should be dissolved by modern science. It has often been pointed out that there is no complete and logical system of faith in the Protestant Churches. They all have breaks in the succession of their truths as in their connection with the early Church. It is comparatively easy, however, for the Catholic scientist to retain his faith and his membership in the Church. He does this not by ignoring the teachings of the Church or minimizing their significance, but, on the contrary, the more he knows about his faith and the more he employs exactly the same powers of intellect on it that gave him his capacity for original investigation in science, the firmer is it likely to be. Pasteur expressed this on a famous occasion to an old clergyman when he declared that he could not understand how people declared that science disturbed their faith.

The editor of the *Boston Transcript*, September 9, 1911, after speaking of Dr. Dwight's high moral courage, his perfectly frank and fearless expression of opinion and the genuine worth and ability, the keen perception of which had led to his election as professor of anatomy, said of him: "And here we are brought inevitably face to face with another no less important nor significant aspect of Dwight's intrinsicity as a man—his ardent and ever-militant Catholicism. Without taking this into account no consideration of him would be complete. It, as it were, explains all the rest of him. Although not actually born within the Roman Catholic communion, he may none the less truly be said to have been a predestined Catholic. His Catholic faith was a direct, unmistakable expression of his whole inner nature, of his irrepressible, innate bent for the recognition of, obedience to and legitimate exercise of authority. He was a born authoritarian, if the word may be coined. Deeply religious by nature, he could have satisfied his own peculiar religious constitution in no other way. Practical manifestation of his deep religiousness was evident in many ways, but one may be pardoned for mentioning the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, the Roman Catholic organization for the relief and care of the poor, of which we was president and in which he spent himself generously, with immense results, to this noble cause."

In 1883 Professor Dwight, just after his acceptance of the professorship at Harvard, married Miss Sara Catherine Iasigi, a descendant of a Greek family that had lived in Boston for several generations and was devoutly Catholic. This union served to strengthen Dr. Dwight's own Catholicity, and their household became a model of Christian happiness. Dr. Dwight soon realized

that his Catholicity must show itself not only in attendance to Church duties, but also in that personal service to those in need that must be the expression of a truly Christian spirit. Accordingly he associated himself with the Conference of St. Vincent de Paul in Boston, and soon became a leading spirit, and eventually for many years its president.

For those who may not know the story of the foundation of the Conference of St. Vincent de Paul a word may be said to show how suitable this work was to Professor Dwight's position, and what an opportunity it gave him for the exercise of his influence. Frederick Ozanam, a brilliant young teacher of literature and philosophy at the University of Paris in the early part of the nineteenth century, was impatient, above all, with the expressions that he heard around him in the university life of the time that Christianity was an outworn creed, whose formulas could not help in the solution of modern social problems. When he protested against such expressions a number of his colleagues and many of those around him in the life of the university quarter asked him to show them where the Church was employed in doing its service of care for the poor and the ailing, for the unfortunate and the needy, and how it was helping in the uplift of the masses of humanity.

Owing to the disturbances occasioned by the French Revolution, the confiscation of Church property, the execution of many priests and Bishops, the scattering of the hierarchy and the difficulties of subsequent reorganization, the Church in Paris at this time was not, it must be frankly confessed, making itself felt in the life of the people to such a degree that an ardent Catholic like Ozanam could be proud of it. Indeed, its accomplishment in social service was a poignant disappointment. Instead of finding fault with ecclesiastical authorities so hampered by conditions that they could not act successfully in the matter as yet, Ozanam proceeded to supply for the defect he saw in the very simple way of organizing a bureau of personal service to be taken up by Catholic laymen, their work to be accomplished under the direction of ecclesiastical superiors. This was the origin of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, as they were called. Their proclaimed purpose was to become personally acquainted with the poor, to know their wants at first hand, to help them when they absolutely needed it by alms, but above all to help them to help themselves. They endeavored to keep families together, to keep the boys from bad company, the girls from evil influences, to find work for those who were without it, to help widowed mothers in the care of their children, to see that education should be provided for them, and in general to prove the friend in need—that is, a friend in deed. These Conferences of St.

Vincent de Paul now exist all over the world, and have been particularly successful in America. It is easy to understand what an opportunity for the expression of Christian zeal and charity they afforded to Professor Dwight.

Perhaps the best idea of Professor Dwight's simple faith will be gathered from the following paragraphs, which occur in the preamble of the resolutions of condolence passed by the St. Vincent de Paul Society just after his death. The resolutions are so different from what is ordinarily supposed to be the attitude of men of our time towards the things of faith as to be noteworthy. Usually such expressions are thought of as almost mediæval. Simple faith and humble, earnest purpose, however, are still as characteristic of Catholic men when on Christian service bent as they ever were. The society said:

"Professor Dwight was president of the Holy Cross Conference when the former president of the Council, Thomas F. Ring, died, and the presidency became vacant. After several meetings and prayerful deliberations, Dr. Dwight was requested to allow his name to be proposed to fill the vacancy.

"When first approached by the committee he hesitated to give a decided answer, and asked for time to think the matter over. He said that he feared that his numerous professional engagements would prevent him from performing the duties of the office, and also that he had a strong doubt of being able to come up to the high standard established by Mr. Ring.

"After a week's deliberation and consulting with several of his particular friends, he informed the committee that he considered the call as coming from a higher Power, and consented to allow his name to go to the Council to be voted on. At the next meeting he was unanimously elected.

"How fittingly Professor Dwight filled the position and how faithfully and satisfactorily he performed its duties is well known to every member of the society.

"He gave his valuable time and mature judgment to the work, sacrificing many hours in attending the meetings, consulting with his officers and in visiting conferences. His name and influence have tended greatly in bringing the practical charitable work of the society to the notice of the public and placing the society on a higher plane in the community than ever before.

"Dr. Dwight's intercourse with the members of the society has been of the most brotherly nature. His universal courtesy and innate gentlemanly character endeared him to all. His name and deeds will long be remembered and be bright examples to every member of the society."

Professor Dwight was not of those who, however, believe that the whole of man's religious duty consists in service to humanity. He had no share at all in that very interesting illusion that has, during the past few generations, come over those outside of the Church who are still professing Christians. When Protestantism broke away from Catholicity the great rule of religion was to be "faith, but not works." The Gospel of James, which proclaimed the value of good works, was, in Luther's words, a gospel of straw. If a man only believed firmly, it mattered little what he did. A transformation has come, however, and now those who somehow still continue to look up to Luther as a great reformer have changed their ground and insist that it really matters not what a man believes, but what he does for others. Religion has changed from faith in divinity to charity towards man. What was a divine religion has changed to the religion of humanity. The old Church teaching was in Luther's time and still is: believe firmly and manifest your faith by good works. Good works alone without other manifestations of a faith are not sufficient, however. Besides service to humanity, Professor Dwight was convinced of the necessity of service to the Divinity directly, as far as that is possible in this imperfect state. Prayer was for him, however, a great, living act of worship and adoration, and as important for the life of the soul as service for one's neighbor. While chronicling his interest in the work of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, we must not forget that he was the founder in Boston of the devotion of the Holy Hour, in which men spend once a month an hour before the Blessed Sacrament in prayer and meditation. It may seem strange to some to think of a professor of anatomy in the modern time going from his dissecting room to his Holy Hour of devotion before the Blessed Sacrament, but that strangeness is only due to certain quite recent developments in a population that is losing its faith. Of many a scientist of the olden time of Ozanam, of Ampère, of Galvani, of Laennec, of Pasteur, of Theodor Schwann, of Johann Müller, of O'Dwyer, of Volta, to say nothing of the great mediæval scientists, Aquinas and Albertus Magnus, whose sanctity has been proclaimed by the Church, the practice of even prolonged prayer is a well confirmed historical tradition. Professor Dwight was only following the footsteps of great Catholic exemplars in his fostering for himself and others of a habit of prayer.

One who was very close to Professor Dwight and his family, writing of him in *America*, September 30, 1911, said:

"The world knew Thomas Dwight as the distinguished scientist and teacher. Boston also had a reason to be proud of him as a faithful public servant. These services alone would make more

than an ordinary creditable record for one human life. Yet there is another phase of his character—his life as a Catholic.

"It is interesting to note that in connection with Pasteur's words as to his own firm faith that Dr. Dwight stated to his son, less than two years ago, that he had never suffered any temptations against faith. There is no reason to think that there is any other record for these last months of his life. His faith had the simplicity and straightforwardness of that of a child, and as a most loyal son of the Church he never swerved in his hearty submission to her decrees. If the Church spoke, that sufficed for him. It was no commonplace Catholic life that could ever have satisfied that loyal Catholic soul, and he lived what he professed. The same signal ability, the same earnestness of purpose, the same enthusiasm shown in so many other ways had in his Catholic work that ineffable something more added which only the supernatural motive could give. He most truly sanctified his talents in his work for the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, of which he was for many years a prominent and devoted member, and at the time of his death still held the position of president of the General Council. His work for the society was wholly in the spirit of the founder, holding the conviction that the good done to the soul of the man privileged to be a worker was far greater than that of the recipient of charity."

There are some extremely interesting traditions with regard to Professor Dwight and his dissecting room work. The bodies that come to dissecting rooms in America are those of the very poor who have died in some public institution and have absolutely no friends to care for them. It is about as tragic an ending of life as one can well imagine, for there surely have been times in life when most of the owners of these bodies, one might well say all of them, have had high hopes and have not thought at all of the possibility of death amidst neglect and friendlessness. Professor Dwight felt a certain responsibility toward the former owners of the bodies whose abandoned property he was now using to such good advantage. Accordingly he made it a rule that he should have Masses said for the souls of the bodies that came to the dissecting room. It was a precious religious idea, but it is an extremely taking humanitarian thought that for these poor, abandoned creatures, of whom the English poet said: "Rattle his bones over the stones, is only a pauper whom nobody owns." Some one should have had the fine feeling to think of their future in this very practical way. The advance of science in modern time is supposed to take the educated away from the fine, old-fashioned customs—or superannuated superstitions, as some do not hesitate to call them—with regard to prayers for the dead, and, above all, with regard to the offering of Masses for souls.

Sneers at such Church money-making arrangements are not uncommon. Far from any such thoughts, this great anatomist—not for his friends, but for the forgotten, neglected ones whom others had no thought for, and who had died friendless or their bodies would not come to him—thought it worth while to make offerings every year as a satisfying act of charity.

And yet this simple faith should not surprise any one who knows the biographic history even of our modern science, for it cannot be too often repeated that our greatest nineteenth century scientists have not been unbelievers, but, on the contrary, have nearly always been even devout upholders, if not of some definite religion, at least of the fact that science itself, as Lord Kelvin declares, teaches us the existence of a Creator, and that the contemplation of the material world around us, even apart from living things, as Clerk Maxwell frequently proclaimed, shows us the existence not only of a Creator, but of great laws of the universe which indicate His providential care of the world. There may be, indeed there must be, mysteries in the relation of the infinite to the finite. If God were entirely comprehensible to man, man would be greater than God. We actually rise above even the immensity of the universe by being able to understand it thoroughly so far as we know it. It must be different to the moral order, but the existence of mysteries is only an argument for, and not at all against, the existence of God.

While it is sometimes said, in the words of an old maxim, that where there are three physicians, there are two atheists, we do not find this exemplified when the roll of great original investigators in medical sciences in the nineteenth century is called. The great father of modern German medicine, Johann Müller, the teacher of that great group of medical biologists among whom were Virchow, and Schwann, and Du Bois-Reymond, and Brücke and Clapperade and Remak, was a devout Catholic; so was his great pupil, Theodor Schwann, to whom we owe the discovery of cells and the foundation of modern biology. So was Laennec, the father of modern physical diagnosis, the greatest clinical student of medicine during the nineteenth century; so also was Corrigan, to whom we owe so much of our knowledge with regard to heart conditions. But these are not all: Claude Bernard, the great French physiologist, during the last five years of his life returned to the devout practice of his religion as a Catholic. Pasteur, the greatest medical scientist of the nineteenth century, lies buried in a little chapel under the main door of the Pasteur Institute, where, by his request, Mass is said regularly for his soul; and all his life he had been not only a devout Catholic, but a great scientist who could not understand how science was supposed in any way to disturb faith. The more he knew, he said,

the deeper was his faith. "If I had all the knowledge I would like to have, I would have the faith of a Breton peasant. If I knew all there was to be known, I should have the faith of a Breton peasant woman." That is usually supposed to be the limit in faith, and is about the equivalent of an Irish peasant woman's belief, the two being of the same Celtic race.

What is thus true in the medical sciences, where, according to tradition, we might expect to find just the contrary, is exemplified in any science the lives of whose great contributors are well known. Of the men after whom units of electricity are named, because the International Electrical Congress thought they deserved that honor for their discoveries in electrical science, nearly every one is a Catholic. Galvani died asking to be buried in the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis; Volta's favorite devotion was the rosary. Coulomb belonged to the Church, and so did Ohm. Ampère was like Pasteur, only probably with even more of piety in his make-up, and the traditions show him to us as particularly devout in his devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Among Protestants, such men as Faraday, Lord Kelvin, Clerk Maxwell and Oersted are on record with strong expressions of the deepest belief in religious principles, and with the firmest grasp on the ideas that underlie the relations of God to man and of man to his fellows in our human responsibility.

On the other hand, it is rather interesting to realize what is thought of the scientific standing of some of the scientists who have been most ardent in their declarations of the absolute incompatibility of science and faith. Professor Haeckel, for instance, while acknowledged as a scientific authority with regard to certain lower forms of life, owes his popular reputation and the immense vogue of his books to his writings with regard to the moral aspects of the world and the denial of any possible religion for a man of science. Professor Dwight, then, has shown how thoroughly discredited Haeckel is by his fellow-scientists in Germany in order to contrast in his chapter on "Thought of the Day" with that scientific opinion the popular estimation of Haeckel. If Haeckel were right in his contentions, then there could be no reconciliation of faith and science. But Haeckel's science has been impugned by fellow-scientists whose reputations are greater even than his own, and they have pointed out that he hesitates at no subterfuge to prove his point and scruples at no petty deceit in order to obtain a basis for his contentions. Because of the contrast between Dwight himself and Haeckel—their years run nearly contemporary—it seems worth while to quote Professor Dwight at some length (p. 21) :

"I should be glad to pass this man by without more words, but

for the very reason that he is looked upon as a leader and a prophet—not by the ignorant alone, but by many who should know better—for their enlightenment it is necessary to show what his word is worth. This was done as long ago as 1874 by the late Professor Wilhelm His, the great embryologist, and one of the most respected leaders of science.

“In a book entitled ‘Unser Körperform und das physiologische Problem ihrer Entstehung’ His shows how Haeckel in the first edition of his ‘Naturliche Schöpfungsgeschichte,’ wishing to show the likeness of embryos of different species, gives on page 242 figures of the egg, one hundred times magnified, of man, the ape and the dog; and on page 248 also three figures of the embryo of the dog, of the chick and of the turtle. His points out quite amusingly certain features of resemblance in the three figures of these two series. Not only are these figures identical in outline, but in non-essentials also. Thus it happens that the granules in a certain part of the dog’s egg are coarser than in the other parts, and there is an absolutely identical arrangement in the eggs of man and of the ape. Very remarkably, the first vertebra in the embryos of the dog, chick and turtle is a little more rounded on the right side, and the ninth a trifle narrower than the others. In short, to make the pretended similarity as striking as possible Haeckel used in two instances the same figure and gave it three different names. This fraud was pointed out by Professor Rutimeyer in ‘Archiv für Anthropologie,’ Bd. III., s. 301. Professor His remarks that one would expect a retraction and excuse for the mistake; but no. ‘Instead of this, Haeckel, in the preface of his later editions, heaped heavy insults on Professor Rutimeyer, equally untrue in their substance as dishonorable in their form. He, however, saw fit to omit the duplicates. But the exposure did him no good. Professor His tells us that in the fifth edition of the same work of Haeckel’s there is a copy from Bischoff of the figures of an embryo of a dog, and from Ecker of one of a human embryo, both assumed to be of four weeks. He points out certain peculiarities of these ‘copies’ well worthy of notice. ‘For,’ he asks, ‘is it through a mistake of the lithographer that in Haeckel’s dog embryo precisely the frontal part of the head is three and one-half millimetres longer than in Bischoff’s, but in the human embryo the forehead is shortened by two millimetres, and at the same time, by the pushing forward of the eye, made narrower by fully five millimetres?’ In short, what purported to be copies of figures published by leading authorities and respectable men were falsifications made to show a similarity which does not exist between the embryos of man and dog. His then points out false dealings by Haeckel in the matter of illustrations, some of which he declares to

have been invented (erfunden), and remarks very justly that his play with facts is far more dangerous than his play with words, inasmuch as it requires an expert to denounce it. He charges that Haeckel well knew the influence that he exercised on a large circle. 'Let, then, others honor Haeckel as an efficient and reckless party leader; according to my judgment he has forfeited through his methods of fighting even the right to be counted as an equal in the company of serious investigators' (p. 171). There is only to add that Haeckel, in spite of plenty of subsequent exposures, has not reformed his ways."

Not alone as men live must we judge them, but as they die, "for it is fated to all men once to die." Professor Dwight's utter peacefulness, yet thoroughgoing devotion to his daily work while death hung over him, attracted the attention of many of his colleagues, who knew what the near future held in store for him. They could not but admire him, and, as he himself attributed his state of mind to his faith, they could not help but think much of a faith that thus proved helpful under the stress of the greatest emergency of life. His biographer in the *Boston Medical and Surgical Journal* said: "To Dr. Dwight himself, and especially to all who had the privilege of working with him in his department, it was a source of great gratification to see how much he accomplished in the last two years when he was under the sentence of death. The excellence of his instruction and of his last contributions to anatomical science showed that he was fully justified in continuing his work to the end and practically dying in harness. To accomplish all this under such peculiarly trying conditions showed the extent of his cheerfulness and courage. Though most of the time suffering much discomfort, and often actual pain, he never complained, and seemed actually to do all he could to make everything go smoothly. His strong religious faith was of great help and encouragement to him at this time, and aided him greatly to accomplish what he did. His own courage and resolution to show no signs of weakness were beyond all praise, and the results attained under a handicap which must have been greater than one can easily realize must be due to those qualities. His was a splendid example of what can be done under the most trying conditions at a time when it seemed as if it were impossible to continue, and was a fitting end to an unselfish, laborious and notable career."

Every one who knew him was struck by the calmness with which he faced death. Malignant disease, especially when it affects an internal organ, is, in spite of all our vaunted advance in medicine, likely to be fatal if it once gains a good foothold. In Dr. Dwight's case it was very early manifest that the termination of his disease

would be inevitably fatal. Only a physician is sure to be able to realize the absolute truth of such a prognosis. The non-medical patient is likely to have some hope until the fatal issue is rather close. Two years before his death Dr. Dwight knew that death was upon him, and that it was only a question of a comparatively short time before his disease would take him away. He faced that certain prospect not with stoicism, but with Christian fortitude. Certain things he wanted to leave completed, so he calmly set about them in spite of pain and discomfort and whatever of solicitude there might be as to the painful termination of his disease. His book, "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist," which had been taken up and put aside a number of times, was now a task to be completed. He finished it, sent it to the printer and had the satisfaction of knowing from the preliminary reviews of it that he was leaving to his generation a precious legacy of philosophic and scientific thought on subjects where faith and science touch, and on which his lifelong studies had given him the right to opinions.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York City.

REGINALD POLE, PRINCE OF THE CHURCH.¹

IT IS impossible to write in terms of too high praise of the manner in which the author of the interesting volume before us has discharged the task he undertook when he set himself to prepare a biography of one of the most fascinating and remarkable of the many fascinating and remarkable characters who crowd the stage of English history. Mr. Haile does not exaggerate in even the least degree when he says, at the very opening of the handsome volume before us, that: "Few figures stand out from among the shadows of the past more clearly or with a friendlier aspect than does that of Reginald Pole—learned, simple-minded, pious, endowed with intellectual gifts of the highest order, wise and prudent in counsel, ardently zealous and yet patient and long-suffering in the extreme, and with a rectitude of mind as true to its conscience as the needle to the pole. Of a jocund humor, which many waters could not quench, and delightful in conversation, he was endeared to his contemporaries by qualities that have left a memory and a fragrance which time does not stale, but carries on from age to age." Even his most

¹ "Life of Reginald Pole," by Martin Haile, second edition. London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1911.

prejudiced enemies, and he had many, were compelled to acknowledge his abilities, his virtues and the splendid spirituality of his life. The man's personal charm, produced by his great grace of manner, intense holiness of life and complete mastery of all the learning of the time, secured the admiration and affection of all with whom he came in contact. It would have been strange if Reginald Pole had been other than he was, seeing the stock from which he sprung. "After the Battle of Bosworth, the fortune of the field, the axe and the assassin had reduced the immediate representatives of the House of York to three in number, frail shoots of the once flourishing White Rose: Edward, the little Earl of Warwick and Salisbury, only son of the beheaded Clarence, and though only ten years old, already held in durance for the past two years by Richard III. in Sheriff Hutton Castle; the child's elder sister, Margaret Plantagenet, and his cousin Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Edward IV.² Henry VII. secured the latter princess by marrying her himself; he hastened to remove the Earl of Warwick from Sheriff Hutton Castle to the more rigorous confinement of the Tower, and looking about for a safe bestowal for the Lady Margaret, gave her in marriage to a kinsman of his own, and one of his closest adherents, Sir Richard Pole, a Knight of the Garter, son of Sir Geoffrey Pole, who had married Edith St. John, half-sister to Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII.'s mother."³ Reginald Pole was the third son of the union between Sir Richard Pole and Margaret Plantagenet. The marriage resulted in the birth of four sons and two daughters.

On the 28th of November, 1499—three months before the birth of the future Cardinal—Henry VII., acting, it is said, under Spanish influence, had the unfortunate young Earl of Warwick, Lady Pole's brother, executed on Tower Hill. The reason generally assigned for this cruel and monstrous deed is that King Ferdinand of Spain refused to permit the betrothal of his daughter, Katherine of Aragon, to Henry's eldest son, Arthur, Prince of Wales, so long as Warwick, whose legitimate claim to the throne was incontrovertible, lived. The dispatches of the Spanish Ambassador still exist to show how persistent were his efforts to secure the execution of the Earl, who was only twenty-four years of age and had been in captivity for sixteen years. Every one knows what followed—how Katherine of Aragon was nominally married to Prince Arthur—then thirteen years of age—how her boy husband, in name

² Mr. Haile says: "Edmund de la Pole, chief of the Yorkist party, was an outlawed, wandering exile in France, and the claims of Edward IV.'s younger daughters were of little account during the lifetime of Elizabeth and her descendants." "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 2.

³ "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 3.

only, died within two years, and how the Princess—in order to maintain the Spanish alliance—was promptly betrothed to the future Henry VIII., thus laying the foundation of all the false pretenses which eventually led to the breach with the Holy See and the Protestantizing of England. It was on the 3d of March, 1500, that Reginald Pole was born, at Stourton Castle, Staffordshire. His father, Sir Richard, was not only a wealthy land owner, but also the holder of many high offices of a civil and semi-military nature. Mr. Haile remarks that, consequently: "For the first five years of his life Reginald Pole lived in the bustling activity and commotion of his father's house, we had almost said his father's court, so numerous and so varied were the individuals who went to make up the retinue, or, as it was called, the 'family' of an important personage of that period—from the chaplain, pages, ladies-in-waiting, squires, minstrels, perhaps a dwarf or a jester, and the numerous servants, who still live for us in Shakespeare's plays; with the crowd of retainers without, both horse and foot, bill and bowmen, armorers, falconers and many more down to the swineherds and hewers of wood and drawers of water—to each and all of whom the master's will was law, and every well-appointed castle had its dungeon for the unruly. Both within and without there was a mixture of magnificence and ceremonial, with a great simplicity of custom—sharp distinctions and yet closer bonds of union and mutual reliance between the lord and his men and the lady and her women. In Margaret Plantagenet the King had bestowed upon Sir Richard Pole a wife such as Solomon described as the prudent woman, whose household is clothed in scarlet and whose price is far above rubies."⁴ Lady Pole had, at any early date after the arrival in England of Katherine of Aragon, secured the confidence, affection and sympathy of that Princess, who fully recognized and proportionately deeply deplored the cruelty of the execution of the Earl of Warwick. Moreover, the death of Sir Richard Pole in 1505 made his widow still more an object of commiseration to the future Queen. On the 22d of April, 1509, King Henry VII. died, and although, for some occult reason of his own, he had compelled his son to sign a protest against his intended marriage to Katherine, there is no reason to suppose that the boy had any genuine objection of his own to the proposed arrangement. Indeed, if he had, it is doubtful if he would have dared to express it, for it is on record that the King, when he deemed it necessary, did not hesitate to subject his heir to tremendous personal chastisement. This, of course, was only in accordance with the universal practice of the time, children being treated with a

⁴ "Life of Reginald Pole," pp. 5, 6.

severity which would seem appalling to modern parents. The probability is that the purpose Henry VII. had in mind was to keep the document in reserve for use if Ferdinand played him false and it should seem politic not to allow the marriage contract to be fulfilled. The best evidence that the Prince was not a willing author of the protest is that within two months of his father's death, being then Henry VIII., he insisted on carrying out his engagement and on his marriage to Katheryn being solemnized. He was then eighteen years of age, while she was nearly twenty-five. The act was a perfectly voluntary one, and Mr. Haile remarks that "all accounts agree as to the happiness of the union, when the music-loving, lusty Prince, as fond of his studies—theological and other—as he was of sport and games, was the delight of all beholders, full of good impulses and ready to further the good of his people. He was as ready as his wife to undo, as far as it was possible, the injury his father had done to Margaret Pole; and one of the first acts of his reign was to bestow on her an annuity of £100.⁵ In 1512 the King began to pay £12 a year for the maintenance of her son Reginald at school; and the following year, 14th of October, 1513, he created her Countess, by her brother's second title, Salisbury, and gave her the family lands of the earldom, in fee."⁶ This, however, did not exhaust the King's idea of the reparation which was due to the Countess and her family. The original attainder of Warwick was reversed on the perfectly obvious ground that: "Being of the age of eight years, until the time of his decease, remaining and kept in ward and restrained from his liberty, as well within the Tower of London, as in other places having none experience nor knowledge of the worldly policies, nor the laws of this realm, so that, if any offense were by him done . . . it was rather by innocency than of any malicious purpose." Further, the King bestowed on Henry Pole—her eldest son—a special livery of his father's lands, namely, the manors of Illesborough and Medmenham, in Buckinghamshire, while on the 25th of September, 1513, in the church at Tournay, where the royal banner was displayed, His Majesty, after Mass, knighted him in company with forty-nine other gallant gentlemen who in battle had rendered valorous service against the followers of the French King. The family possessions were now of great extent, but they were charged with many exactions levied by Henry towards defraying the cost of his foreign warrings. One receipt exists for £1,000—upwards of £20,000 of our present money—paid by Lady Margaret, as "part payment of 5,000 marks granted of her benevo-

⁵ Equivalent to about £2,000, or \$10,000, of present-day currency.

⁶ "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 8.

lence towards the King's wars . . . for his high and great goodness in restoring her to the inheritance of her brother." In June, 1313, while his brother was still at the wars, Reginald Pole began his studies at Oxford. There is an entry in his college record of the receipt by him of the first payment of a pension which the Prior thereof was bound to pay to every student nominated by the King, until released from the charge by finding for him "a competent benefice." The arrangement illustrates in convincing fashion the deplorable condition into which Church affairs had got under the baneful influence of Royal interference in their administration. How monstrously far this interference was carried is proved by the fact that when he was only seventeen years of age Reginald Pole was nominated by the King prebendary of Roscomb in the Cathedral of Salisbury, and of Gatminster-secunda in the same church; and soon after had the Deanery of Wimborne Minster bestowed on him. No doubt the boy's mother desired that he should become a priest, and his studies were directed towards this end, but at the time when the benefices named were bestowed on him he had not received even minor orders and was still a simple laic. Abbot Gasquet in his well-known work, "*Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*," says: "No less detrimental to the well-being of the Church in England at this time was the crying abuse and scandal of pluralities. . . . At this time also benefices were bestowed upon the young of good family, who had sufficient influence to secure these preferments."⁷ The fact that Pole's collegiate career was one of extraordinary brilliancy in no degree excuses what took place. It is perfectly clear that at that very time the Queen was laying plans to bring about the marriage of Reginald Pole to her yet child daughter, the Princess Mary, a project about which more was to be heard in later years.

The first life of Cardinal Pole published was that written by his friend and secretary, Ludovico Beccatelli, Archbishop of Ragusa, which was printed at Venice in 1563. Referring to some of the statements in this, Mr. Haile says: "Cardinal Pole was himself Beccatelli's informant as to the events of his early life, and it is interesting to find how early the question of a marriage between the cousins—which in the days of her sorrow was again to be considered by the Queen and the Emperor—had been mooted. From that time forth, Reginald Pole's pretensions to Mary's hand were to be—so to speak—in the air, and well liked of the English people, always averse to a foreign prince as king. While it is clear that he had no ambition that way himself, he was nevertheless looked upon as numbered among the numerous candidates, and

⁷ "*Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*," p. 25.

not as one of the least eligible." That Pole himself ever seriously contemplated living a secular life and entering into matrimony is, at least, doubtful, while it is certain that all his studies were essentially of a kind tending to qualify him for the ecclesiastical state. On this point Mr. Haile says:⁸ "Pole's own love of learning, the enthusiasm displayed by his chief preceptor, Linacre, for the '*sancta mater studiorum*,' the fact that the most distinguished among the learned men, who were his teachers or his friends, had received their education at Padua—Linacre and William Latimer, Dr. Rich- and Pace (Secretary of State and Ambassador to Venice), Lupset (his secretary), Tunstall (Bishop of Durham), Dr. Colet (Dean of St. Paul's), and many others—naturally inclined him towards that great university. He had now lived twenty years, seven of which he had spent at Oxford, 'and his mother and family consented to a step which seemed to second the hopes he had already raised both in them and the whole nation.' The consent of the King had also to be obtained, and was granted without difficulty. Henry VIII. seems to have fully shared his wife's affection for his brilliant young kinsman, though not her views as to his marriage with her daughter; he rejoiced in Reginald's learning and distinction, and notwithstanding the noble provision he had already made for his support, he gave him £100 towards his expenses for a year (equivalent to £2,000 at the present day). It was, therefore, with a princely retinue and considerable state that Pole started from England and made his journey towards Padua. It will not be amiss to give here some account of his personal appearance. Becatelli thus describes him:

"Of medium height and thin, in complexion white and red, as are commonly the English; his face a little broad, with merry and benignant eyes, and in youth his beard was rather fair—*quasi bianda*. He was robust of body, and seldom sick . . . moderate in eating, although of a healthy appetite, which ill supported fasting; he ate only twice a day, and his evening meal was slight; he slept lightly, and generally rose before dawn, to attend to his studies and devotions; he did not care for much personal service, and often got up and went to bed without assistance. In England and abroad he was noted for the chastity of his life and conversation. He was not ambitious of wealth—*di robba non fu cupido*—that which he had he spent and cheerfully gave. He wished his familia to be well treated, he avoided all debts and made his expenditure accord with his revenue.'"

It was in the spring of 1519 that the future Cardinal arrived at Padua to commence his studies in its famous university, which

⁸ "Life of Reginald Pole," pp. 13, 14.

had, however, suffered seriously and been almost deserted by both students and professors during the nine years between 1508 and 1517, owing to the disasters and turmoils created by the wars of the League of Cambray. On entering the city he was met by all the chief civic officials and greeted as a person of high distinction, a compliment probably inspired by knowledge of his close connection with the Crown of England, whose then holder was generally regarded as one of the most genuinely Catholic of the sovereigns of Europe. The scene, as depicted by Mr. Haile, must have been impressively brilliant. He says: "The university, still familiarly called the 'Bo,' from the fact that it stood on the place of a famous old hostelry, *Il Bove*, or the Bull Inn—which had been able to accommodate more than 600 guests, with stabling for 200 horses—had between 1,000 and 1,200 students, the same number, strange to say, as it has now. The rectors in their *togas*, the pompous Podestà and the Capitan with their officers, the students in their many-colored garments, and with flashing weapons, which the authorities were perpetually confiscating, moved about the streets with a gay contrast of coloring to the dull sameness of their present-day costume and attire. The conduct of the students, despite occasional broils and faction fights ending in bloodshed, was less turbulent than might be expected. The reports of the rectors of the Venetian Signory, as well as that of each Podestà on terminating his sixteen months of office, and of the Capitan are, on the whole, favorable.⁹ To the young Englishman exchanging the dull skies of his country for the brightness of Italy nothing can have been more satisfying to the artistic side of his nature than to find himself in such a town as Padua at the moment he arrived there; and we can hardly conceive what a training to the eye and mind of so intelligent a youth as Reginald Pole it must have been to happen upon Italy in the year of grace 1519."¹⁰ The city, its churches and colleges were growing in grandeur day by day under the hands of the greatest architects and artists of Italy, while within its halls were teaching or studying the most learned scholars of the time. Pole found himself surrounded by all those elements of culture which he loved.

In the early portion of 1525 Pole visited Rome, in order to

⁹ The retiring Podestà, in his report to the Signory, 1st March, 1519, says the students were not so steady as they had been "in ancient times." But on the same date Dr. Nicolo Michiel, advocate of the Commune, reports that little of moment has happened although the students fêted the carnival in their usual manner; but he has opened an inquiry into the death of the Veronese student, lately killed, and eight students of Verona and Vicenza have been arrested. ("Sanuto's Diary," Vol. XXVII., p. 6.)

¹⁰ "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 16.

fulfill the conditions of the jubilee of that year, but he was not received by the Pope, and there is no record of his having sought an audience. Both Henry VIII. and his mother, Lady Salisbury, were pressing for his return to England, and it was with some difficulty he obtained their permission to visit the Eternal City. It was not until the beginning of 1557 he returned to his native land. As regards his educational status at this time, Mr. Haile says: "Pole had amply fulfilled his promise to Henry VIII. that he would let himself be outdone in diligence by no other student; indeed, few young men can have had less cause for self-reproach in looking back upon their university career or more reason for satisfaction at its results. Not only had he enriched his mind with useful knowledge, but by the interchange of thought with the statesmen and men of learning it had been his good fortune to frequent, had ripened his opinions upon the relations between Church and State, upon the duties and rights of rulers and their people, and had enlarged and heightened his conception of the true philosophy of life. According to the custom of the time only to begin the study of theology at a riper age, Pole had occupied himself chiefly with logic and philosophy, solidly grounding himself in every branch of the 'humanities' before entering upon his theological studies. Besides writing his 'Life of Longolius,' he had collected in his stay at Padua the various readings and emendations of Cicero's works, to which he added his own remarks, with an intent to publish a complete edition of them. 'But the exigencies his country fell into soon after, and the occasion she had for more substantial service than classic learning could yield,' caused the papers to be laid aside, then neglected and finally lost."¹¹

On his arrival in London he was received with much affection and respect, both the King and Queen and, of course, his mother and family being foremost in the general greeting. On all sides it was agreed that he was destined to fill the highest offices of state, to the holding of which his choice of the ecclesiastical life—if he adhered to it—would then have been no barrier. His latest biographer tells us that although, not long after his return to England, Reginald retired to Sheen to study theology, setting up his abode in the house built for himself by the learned Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, under the shadow of the Carthusian monastery—which had been Pole's own first school as a little boy—he found time during the next two years to make himself thorough master of the affairs of his country, to the extent of being able to assure the King, as we have seen, how closely he had studied the financial history of England. As an example of the thoroughness of his

¹¹ Phillips' "Life of Pole," Vol. I., p. 24, published in 1764.

investigations in the subjects which he thought it his duty to know, the fact is remarkable and deserving of remembrance, in considering his future life and undertakings. Although still a layman, he was elected Dean of Exeter on the 12th of August, 1527. The detestable project of the King's divorce was on the eve of being launched, and unfortunately seems to have been originated by Wolsey, who, for mingled dynastic and national reasons, desired to bring about a marriage between Henry and Margaret, the widowed Duchess of Alençon, sister of the King of France. The Cardinal does not seem to have suspected his master's infatuation for Anne Boleyn, or, if he did, to have regarded it as merely one of those immoral intrigues to which the latter was not disinclined. Mr. Haile says: "Few men can ever have been more dismayed than was Wolsey, on discovering that he had labored to dislodge the daughter of Isabella the Catholic, not in favor of a daughter of France, but of Lady Boleyn, one of the most ill-reputed women of the English Court. Cavendish reports, and probably with truth, that when the King first disclosed his intention to Wolsey, the latter fell on his knees and endeavored, without effect, to dissuade him."¹² We need not here, however, go over the story of the divorce proceedings, which occupies a considerable amount of space in Mr. Haile's admirably painstaking work. Our concern is only with the part played in connection with them by Reginald Pole.

On this point Mr. Haile says that the future Prince of the Church was brought face to face with the detested question of the divorce before he had been very long in England, and his withdrawal to Sheen was no less from a desire to get away from discussions which he could not expect to influence than in order to continue his theological studies undisturbed by the distractions of the Court. Sir Thomas More at this time shunned the Court as much as he could—

"He knew how hard it was to contend with one whose arguments he could not admit without peril of his conscience, or contradict without peril of his life. His learning, his reputation, his legal acquirements were sure to point him out to the King as the one man above all others in the kingdom whose judgment on the question none would venture to impugn, and few would be inclined to dispute."¹³

The above words are entirely applicable to the younger man who, if his reputation was not as great as More's, had an equal integrity of mind, which could neither be blurred nor biased by his ardent gratitude and affection for Henry VIII., nor by the love

¹² "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 50.

¹³ Brewer, Introduction to Vol. IV., p. ccxx.

and reverence he bore the Queen, his constant friend, and whose great wish it had been to call him son—a wish which the poor Queen's distaste for the scheme now on foot, to deliver up her little daughter as a bride to an elderly debauchee like the King of France, no doubt revived and enhanced. The infamous and unscrupulous Thomas Cromwell, who was destined to be Wolsey's successor, was selected as a fitting instrument to sap by specious arguments Pole's integrity, but the latter's clearness of intellect and knowledge of theological teaching on the subject stood him in good stead and enabled him to reject the theories of that base intriguer with the contempt they deserved. Pole, moreover, determined that his best course was to leave England altogether, and accordingly, he sought and obtained the King's permission to proceed to Paris, in order to continue his studies in its great university. On the 12th of October, 1529, the French Ambassador at the English Court wrote to Paris announcing Pole's departure. On the same day Wolsey was dismissed from all his offices, and the whole world knew that Anne Boleyn had wrought his ruin. That God in His infinite mercy gave him another year of life in which to repent his misdeeds and that he made good use of that period of grace is matter of history. Pole was barely settled in Paris when he received a communication from the King appointing him his Ambassador to the French Court and instructing him to obtain declarations from the theologians of the university favorable to his divorce. This duty Reginald at once declined, on the score of his lack of experience and knowledge, with the result that Henry forthwith sent him a coadjutor, who was less scrupulous, and whom he received in his house, leaving him free to perform a hopeless task. Eventually, by dint of lavish bribery, a declaration from the faculty of the university favorable to the design was secured, after a prolonged and fierce discussion carried by an insignificant majority. Money was lavished in purchasing votes for this palpably worthless pronouncement. Quickly realizing that Pole was in no way inclined to aid his project, Henry recalled him to England, where he again devoted himself to his studies at Sheen. In November, 1530, he was offered the Archbishopric of York or Bishopric of Winchester if he would declare for the divorce, but the bribes were sternly rejected by Pole, who had not then received even minor orders. Henry now insisted that he should take a month to consider the matter, and during that period deluged him with courtesies and compliments, sending various ecclesiastical sycophants to pester him with arguments, but he remained steadfast in his resolve, and eventually told the King to his face that, even if he accepted either of the two preferments, he should still feel bound

to pronounce against the validity of the divorce. In February, 1532, Henry gave him permission to take up his residence on the Continent, through sheer fear that if he appeared in his place in Parliament he would denounce not only the divorce, but his assumption of the headship of the Church in England. Here again we are compelled by considerations of space to refrain from discussing in detail the monstrous events of a monstrous time, which Mr. Haile sets out most fully.

Pole had no intention of remaining in Paris, where he could be so easily pestered by missives from the King, and, accordingly, he quickly removed himself from that city to Avignon. The climate of that place, however, did not suit his health, which was never very robust, and he decided to travel to Venice by way of Carpentras, where he made the acquaintance of the famous and learned Bishop of that diocese, Giacomo Sadoletto. The result was the formation of a friendship which lasted unimpaired until the death of Sadoletto in 1547. During two years Reginald had his headquarters in Venice, but spent much of his time at Padua, continuing his theological studies. He cannot, however, have been ignorant that poor Queen Katherine and all Henry's Continental enemies were desirous that he should return to England, marry the Princess Mary and raise the country against its adulterous and sacrilegious sovereign. Constant correspondence on this subject was going on between the Queen, the Emperor and the King of France, and it is by no means improbable that, had the project been carried out, England might have been saved to the Church. Mr. Haile says: "The subject of these letters was quietly pursuing his studies at Padua and at Venice. The events occurring in England could not but stir to the depths a nature as affectionate and devoted to his country and his King as Reginald Pole's, and from this time forth a shade of mysticism and aloofness from the things of the world became perceptible in his character, and it appeared as if he deemed it impossible that an earnest man should devote himself to any but the highest studies of divinity and theology. His own helplessness to afford a remedy to the heartbreaking acts succeeding each other in England drove home the sense of the vanity of all earthly things, and forced him to turn his mind more and more to that which was transcendental. Not that his sense of humor ever forsook him, any more than his indomitable habit of looking at the best side of things, of hope unquenched by the bitterness of sad experience. The clear judgment, the quickness of wit, clothed occasionally in gentle raillery, or acute irony, remained undimmed, and his conversation was the delight of all who approached him. 'Having much experience of the world,' says his

biographer, Beccatelli, 'with a beautiful manner, *con bella maniera*, he knew how to entertain each person, and did so. And among other things, I never knew a man who had so many fine maxims, *bei motti*, and comparisons as he; they seemed to flourish on his lips without the slightest affectation; and the same may be found scattered through his writings." We are further reminded by Mr. Haile that the sorely troubled life and reign of Pope Clement VII. came to an end in the month of September, 1534, and Cardinal Farnese, in a conclave which only lasted a single day—October 12—was elected to succeed him, taking the title of Paul III. The new Pontiff was a strong man and a determined reformer, intent upon assembling the General Council, which the troubled state of Europe had rendered impossible in the time of his predecessor.¹⁴ In England it was hoped that a change of Popes would bring a change in the King's attitude towards the Holy See; but when the Duke of Norfolk and the Marquis of Exeter ventured to suggest, on the news of Clement VII.'s illness, that the King would make no difficulty as a Catholic prince in obeying the new Pope, "he answered that no one should mock him by advising such a thing, for he would have no greater regard for any Pope that might be chosen than for the meanest priest in his kingdom." In 1535 began the terrible series of executions or martyrdoms by which Henry sought to crush all further opposition to the validity of his divorce and assumption of the headship of the Church in England. On the 29th of April Richard Reynolds, a monk of the Bridgettine monastery of Lyon, with the priors of the three charterhouses of London, Aucholm and Bellevue, were executed because of their rejection of the King's supremacy. Mr. Haile says: "It would be interesting to know whether the news of the death of the Carthusians had reached Rome when, on the 20th of May, the Pope held a consistory and created seven Cardinals, one of whom is thus described in the *Diaria Pontificum*: 'John, Bishop of Rochester, kept in prison by the King of England.'" In either case the Pope, by this open act of honor and approval, testified to his regard

¹⁴ Pietro Balan, in his "Storia di Clemente VII.," justifies that Pope against the accusation of not seriously desiring a general council or the reform of the Roman Curia, showing how he had appointed a commission, of which Giberti, the illustrious Datario and Bishop of Verona, was a member, for the express purpose of reforming the clergy of Rome. "If the work commenced under such favorable auspices failed to produce its full effects, the fault cannot be attributed to lack of good-will in the Pope, but to the political complications which disturbed his pontificate. The same Clement addressed breves to all Christian princes, exhorting them to make peace, in order that a general council might be held for the reform of abuses." (G. B. Pigghi, "Gianmatteo Giberti, Vescova di Verona," Verona, 1900. Quoted in Haile's "Life of Reginald Pole," p. 132.)

for Fisher's sanctity and fidelity. He may have hoped that the red robe, symbol of the blood Cardinals must ever be ready to shed in defense of the Church, might in this case be a protection from the wrath of the King; and men held their breath to see what Henry would do, while Paul III. recommended the new Cardinal to the good offices of the King of France, and explained that in raising the Bishop of Rochester to the purple, he did so in view of the General Council, to which he meant to call all the most learned men of the different countries of Christendom. Henry did not keep the world waiting long for his answer to the Pope's elevation of Fisher; on the 22d of June the new Cardinal's head was struck off on Tower Hill, and on the 6th of July the same fate was awarded to Sir Thomas More, ex-Lord Chancellor of England."¹⁵ Meantime a servile priest, Thomas Starkey, who had acted as Pole's chaplain and secretary in France and Italy, had been appointed one of the royal chaplains and was set the impossible task of obtaining from Reginald a letter of approval of the King's proceeding. Presuming on their former acquaintance, this wretched man simply deluged Pole with communications begging him to write to the effect stated. In the consistory at which the Pope nominated the martyr Bishop of Rochester a Cardinal he also announced his intention of bestowing the red hat on Gaspar Contarini, and one of the first acts of that illustrious Cardinal after taking up his residence in Rome was to write to the Empress Charles V. on June 5, 1535, extolling the ability and virtues of Reginald Pole and pointing out that the latter was convinced that the most likely way of winning back England to the Church was not by force of arms, but "by peace and persuasion." Looking back upon the history of the period it is impossible not to recognize that Pole was right. The use of the armies and navies of France and Spain to reëstablish Papal supremacy was, of course, enough to rally to the support of Henry all the instincts of nationality and material patriotism. Later on, in the days of Elizabeth, the same mistake was made, and English Catholics, perfectly loyal to the Holy See and the Church, were foremost in the work of defeating and destroying the Spanish Armada. Already eminent Bishops and others were beginning to express the hope that the Holy Father might see his way to elevate Pole to the Cardinalate in place of the martyred Fisher.

In England, Henry had set certain time-serving prelates to write books in defense of his assumption of the headship of the Church.

¹⁵ Three centuries later, under the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII., the Carthusians, Cardinal Fisher and Sir Thomas More, received the honor of beatification.

Foremost among these were Richard Sampson, Bishop of Chichester, and Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Their works were soon in the hands of Pole, who had already begun one of his own to the directly contrary effect. This was written in consequence of the persistent appeals of Starkey for an expression of opinion favorable to the King. Its title was "Pro Ecclesiasticæ, Unitatus Defensione," and the first copy issued from the press was sent to Henry. This tremendous and scathing denunciation of the King's crimes was entrusted to Michael Throckmorton for conveyance to London, accompanied by a letter from Pole, the messenger being instructed to place both in the hands of His Majesty. In his letter the writer said:

" . . . first of your chaplain, Mr. Starkey, and afterwards of Mr. Secretary, of your Grace's pleasure that I should declare to you my opinion touching the Pope's supremacy, with other articles, and to state my reasons. I have done so, accordingly, in a book which I send by the bearer. How it will satisfy you, He only knows in whose hand are the hearts of kings.

"If you wish further information of my purpose, I refer you to the bearer. . . . Venice, May 27."

Throckmorton was further instructed to inform the King that Pole's work was a reply to his own challenges and to the false reasonings of Gardiner and Sampson. The present is not the place to examine in detail the arguments advanced by Pole in defense of Papal supremacy. It must suffice to say that these were conclusive and overwhelming. One extract may, however, be quoted to show its absolute fearlessness and the entire disregard of its author for those enormous family interests which he knew were at the mercy of the Tudor savage. Pole wrote:

"Are titles given for nothing, or for less than nothing, that men should call you, the robber and persecutor of the Church, the 'head of the Church?' Your father was a penurious man, but even he founded a few monasteries for the care of the poor; but who can cite any good deed of yours? What are your public works? Pleasure-houses, built for your own gratification, ruined monasteries, wrecked churches, their possessions confiscated to the Crown. . . .

"You have destroyed your nobles on the most frivolous pretenses; you have filled your Court with worthless men, to whom you have yielded everything up. But what shall I say of the butcheries; of the dreadful executions which have made England the slaughter-houses of the innocent? The holiest and most spotless men, for the new crimes invented by yourself, put to death in the most horrible and unheard of manner. The gracious Bishop of Rochester, the unparalleled More, the learned Reynolds and so many others were

the victims of your senseless and wicked fury. In their bloody death no torment was spared to them nor any insult to their religion. All nations mourned when they heard of those frightful tragedies, and even now, after so long a time, tears, as I write, come to my eyes. And you are the man who holds that the Pope, on account of his moral deficiencies, cannot be head of the Church."

The work ended with an almost pathetic appeal to the King to take count of the peril to which his soul was exposed, to repent his sins and make atonement for them, thus deserving the mercy of God. In face, however, of the absolute determination of Henry to do none of these things, an immediate result of Pole's labors was to make his return to his native land impossible, even if he had been desirous of going there. Both Henry and his astute counsellor, Cromwell, however, urged him to do so, but it is most probable that, if he had done so, an early excuse would have been found for his impeachment as a traitor and for his immediate execution. Regarded from their point of view, his guilt was even greater than that of More.

On the 19th of July, 1536, the Pope summoned Pole to Rome, with a view to his participation in the General Council. The Papal letter was a most complimentary one, and concluded by desiring his attendance in virtue of holy obedience. Only one answer was possible, and Pole replied at once; promising to obey the summons, although, with characteristic humility, he avowed his own profound belief in his inability to be of practical service. Before leaving for Rome, however, he wrote, on the 31st of August, to Cardinal Contarini, telling him the latest news he had received from the English Ambassador in Paris. In this letter he told how in England:

"Some nobles are condemned to extreme punishment; and he¹⁶ who had begun courageously to vindicate the Pope's authority in Ireland, and had afterwards surrendered to the King on a promise of pardon, has been condemned with his four uncles; also a brother of the Duke of Norfolk for secretly marrying a daughter of the late Queen of Scotland, has been condemned to death along with his wife.¹⁷ . . . But I rather think that in these cases the King wishes an opportunity of showing mercy, and that is why judgment has been passed upon them; for their deaths would be so unjust

¹⁶ Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, generally known as "Silken Thomas," owing to the magnificence of his attire.

¹⁷ Lord Thomas Howard and Lady Margaret Douglas. The latter was pardoned, but her husband was kept captive in the Tower, while "Silken Thomas" and his four uncles were executed in London. The object, of course, was to destroy a family who possessed far more influence in Ireland than the King. Aliens in race though they originally were, they had become more Irish than the Irish themselves.

as to create intolerable hatred, the Irishman having relied on a public promise, and the others being condemned only on an *ex-post facto* law. We shall soon know."

In October Pole arrived in Rome, being received with great affection by the Holy Father and provided with apartments in the Papal palace. He was at once appointed a member of the Commission nominated by the Pope to undertake the organization of the Council. Almost on the eve of Christmas, His Holiness determined to create him a Cardinal, but he strongly objected that his elevation would be likely to deprive him of whatever influence for good he possessed in England, as his acceptance of a place in the Sacred College would certainly be misrepresented by the King and his creatures. The Pope, however, was not affected by his protests, and on the 22d of December he was appointed to the Cardinalate with eleven others. This is not the place in which to recount all Pole's wonderful work in connection with the Council or his general services to the Church, but these deserve at least some notice, as assuredly do his exertions as Papal Legate at the Court of Queen Mary, but this must be deferred for another article.

WALTER F. DESTERRE.

THE QUESTION OF ALBERT DUERER'S RELIGION.

AMONGST the numerous evils which sprang from the outburst of the Protestant revolt which is familiarly called, but improperly so, the Reformation, the most deplorable and disastrous was the impulse which the habit of lying, that followed in its wake, imbibed therefrom. The crime of bearing false witness became almost general. In every country of Europe, wherever the seeds of revolt had taken hold in the soil, the pen of the forger soon became busy in the manufacture of damaging evidence wherewith to bolster up the claims of covetous and malignant neighbors and kinsmen, in cases wherein landed or personal property was the stake that was to be played for, whether in the royal court or the rural squire's modest holding. We have shown how important a part the skill of the forger played in the condemnation of the hapless Mary Stuart of Scotland. Her case was only one in thousands. Perjury in the courts was the inevitable corollary to the falsehood of the pen. Lying and deception formed part of the everyday life of whole communities in those countries where the axe of the "Reformation" had split the community in twain.

Protestant writers claim Duerer as one of themselves. They do

so on the ground that many expressions of sympathy with Martin Luther are found in the painter's letters and his diary. It is true that he painted a small picture for Luther and presented it to him; but this is not at all to be wondered at. Luther had not then broken away from the Church, but he was attracting great notoriety by his preaching, tentative, merely, at this stage, not positive, as it became later on, when he felt secure in the protection of the Elector and other recalcitrant nobles of Germany. Later, when Luther's preaching became open war and rebellion against the Papal authority, his friends, becoming alarmed for his personal safety, got up a bogus seizure of his person by the troops of the Elector, and a mock imprisonment. Whether Albert Duerer was in the secret of the real nature of this proceeding or not, it is difficult to say; but one may be excused if he conclude from the gush and lamentation that he pours out over the transaction, in his diary, that he was quite aware of the mockery of the whole business and tried to hide it by making the loudest outcry he possibly could, in order to pretend that his grief was genuine. This diary, we may be sure, was shown by the painter to his friends—and he had a very great number of these who used to make of his studio a regular rendezvous for gossiping and criticism and what not else. Here are a few specimens of the stage-play hyperbole:

"Item: On the Friday before Whitsuntide, in the year 1521, the report reached me at Antwerp that Martin Luther had been treacherously taken prisoner, for the herald of the Emperor Charles, to whose care he was committed under the imperial safe-conduct, on arriving at an unfriendly place near Eisenach, rode off, saying that he dared stay no longer with him. Immediately ten horsemen appeared, who treacherously carried off the pious man sold into their hands. He was a man enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and a follower of the true Christian faith. Whether he lives still, or whether his enemies have murdered him, I know not, but he has suffered much for Christ's sake, and because he has rebuked the unchristian Papacy, which strives against the freedom of Christ with its heavy burdens of human laws. . . .

"O God, is Luther dead? Who will henceforth explain to us so clearly the Holy Gospel? Alas, what might not he still have written for us during the next ten or twenty years? Oh, all pious Christian men, bewail with me this God-inspired man, and pray to God to send us another enlightened teacher. O Erasmus of Rotterdam, where dost thou remain? Behold how the unjust tyranny of this world's might and the powers of darkness prevail. Hear, thou knight of Christ; ride forth in the name of the Lord,

defend the truth, attain the martyr's crown; thou art already an old mannikin (Maenniken), and I have heard thee say that thou givest thyself only two years longer in which thou wilt still be fit for work. Employ these well, then, in the cause of the Gospel and the true Christian faith. Lift up thy voice, and so shall not the gates of hell (the See of Rome) as Christ saith, prevail against thee. And although, like thy master, Christ, thou hast to suffer shame on earth, and even die a short time sooner than thou otherwise might, yet wilt thou pass the sooner from death unto life, and be glorified through Christ. For if thou drinkest of the cup of which He drank, so wilt thou reign with Him, and judge justly those who have not acted righteously. O Erasmus, hold to this, and put thy boast in the Lord, as it stands written in David, for thou canst do this, and, in truth, thou mayest prevail to fell this Goliath; for God will uphold His holy Christian Church according to His divine will. May He give us eternal bliss, who is God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, one eternal God. Amen.

"Oh, all ye Christian men, pray to God for help, for His judgment draws nigh, and His righteousness shall be made plain. Then we shall see the blood of the innocent, which Popes, Bishops and monks have spilt, rise up in judgment and condemn them. (Apocal.) And these are the souls of the slain that lie under the altar of God and cry for vengeance, unto which the voice of God replies: 'Fill up the measure with the innocent who are slain, then will I judge.'"

One can readily imagine that in writing this the sly Albert was making a deadly thrust at the vacillating runagate, Erasmus of Rotterdam, who had, frightened at the noise he had helped his friend Martin to make, fled in the night-time and placed himself out of the jurisdiction of the German law officers. The passage in the diary which immediately follows after the outburst we have quoted above is of a grotesquely contrary character. It is, in fact, mundane in the most sordid degree, as will be seen. It runs thus:

"I have reckoned with Jobet, and I owe him 31 florins, and I have paid him, taking into account and deducting two portraits painted in oil colors, for which he gave me out 5 pounds. In all my painting, boarding, selling and other dealings I have had disadvantage in the Netherlands, in all my concerns with high and low; and especially has the Lady Margaret, for all that I have presented her and done for her, given me nothing. And this settling with Jobst was on St. Peter and St. Paul's Day. I gave the Rudiger servant 7 stivers to drink. . . .

"Item. On the Sunday before St. Margaret's Day the King of Denmark gave a grand banquet to the Emperor, the Lady Margaret and the Queen of Spain, and invited me, and I, too, ate there. I

gave 12 stivers for the King's futtural, and I painted the King in oil colors, and he gave me 30 florins." The "King's futtural" was a kind of customary "tip," or "largesse," as the mediæval phrase put it.

It must be owned by the most ardent advocate of the sincerity of the painter's sympathy with "the pious man," Martin Luther, that the grief he had just previously expressed for him by no means deranged the great artist's love for orderly business methods and careful keeping of accounts.

Deceit and dissimulation pervaded the European atmosphere. It was everywhere. The Continent was a house divided against itself. Division reigned at the domestic hearth, whether it was in the baron's hall or the peasant's shieling. Who began that work? It was Luther. At the very outset of his meeting he began to play the game of duplicity boldly, not behind backs, but in the face of all the world. He had published his "Theses," proclaiming in effect that man is justified by faith and not by his good works, no matter how many, and when these were attacked he wrote (in May, 1518): "I care little what pleases or displeases the Pope. He is a man like other men. . . . I listen to the Pope as Pope—that is, when he speaks in the canons agreeably to the canons, or regulates any matters conjointly with a council—but not when he speaks of his own mind."

A few days later after this insolent and uncalled-for defiance of the Holy Father's authority as head of the Church Universal, he whiningly appeals to the object of his fuming scorn, in these terms:

"I throw myself at the feet of your Holiness, and submit myself to you, with all that I have and all that I am. Destroy my cause, or espouse it; take my life, or restore it, as you please: I will receive your voice as that of Christ Himself, who presides and speaks through you. If I have deserved death, I refuse not to die; the earth is the Lord's, and all that therein is. May He be praised forever and ever. May He maintain you to all eternity! Amen."

While he was writing these words the arch-hypocrite was taking careful measure to place himself where he could not be held accountable for his outrageous contumacy. He was getting into the plot to have himself carried off—"moryah!" as the Irish say—as a prisoner by the zealous "Catholic" champion, the Elector of Saxony! He was lighting the torch which was to be the signal for war all over the European Continent—war that lasted for more than a hundred years. He was laying the foundation stone of a temple to the Father of Lies—and he began it, as we have seen, with a most horrible set of lies on his own lips! Little wonder is

it that this illustrious example soon had many distinguished imitators. Little wonder that an admiring friend, or pretended admirer, like Albert Duerer, should take the hint. He had to deal with admirers of the arch-hypocrite, as well as his enemies. His business was at stake. It was most essential that he buy a mask and wear it. Lying was now no disgrace; it was quite the vogue. Machiavelli had not written "The Prince" for nothing. Luther had pleaded to the Pope that his "warm, youthful blood" may have led him astray, but having gone on a wrong track, he refused to be set right! It was not until he arose, says the artless D'Aubigne, that Truth arose to illumine the night of European ignorance. What sublime audacity!

Luther began his apology by a remarkable statement. "Nothing was heard in all the taverns," he commenced, "but complaints of the avarice of the priests, attacks on the power of the Keys and of the supreme Bishop." This was ingenuous, no doubt, but it inevitably suggests the identity of the sources of inspiration which are indicated in Meissonier's famous painting called "La Rixe" and the beginning of the "Reformation." Dr. Martin Luther must have been no novice in the life of the underworld. He knew all about the gossip of the taverns. He was more familiar, in his furtive callow days, with the language of the slums and the taverns than with the conversation of the pious and God-fearing. He had, as he said himself later on, "eaten his peck of salt with the Devil," and knew the taste of the commodity right well! Luther did not stop to tell whence he gleaned his information about the nature of the gossip in the taverns. But the positive way in which he asserted that it was such as he described shows that either he had invented it for the purpose of his argument or that he had made himself perfectly conversant with the condition of affairs he limned out so boldly. The hand that "drew Priam's curtain at the dead of night" had witnessed the beginning of the conflagration about which he had come to tell.

It is argued by those who wish to present Albert Duerer as an apostate that he drew the inspiration for his greatest and most beautiful paintings from the Sacred Scriptures—the book which, as one of the mendacious tribe remarks, "the Pope had so long withheld from Christendom." It may be asked how, if the Pope had withheld it, Albert Duerer managed to get hold of it. Before the words "Protestant" and "Reformation" had ever been heard in the world other painters no less great than Albert Duerer had drawn their inspiration from the same sacred source as he did. The art of printing from movable types was no secret of any of the Popes; they had to wait until it was invented to take advan-

tage of the discovery to spread the knowledge of the Bible, and they lost no time about doing so once the printing press and the movable types became practicable realities. Every honest scholar knows this; it is only the charlatans who make a living by trading on the ignorance of the bigoted section of mankind who dares to assert now that the Popes kept the Bible from the people. The most glorious era in art had its zenith in the period immediately preceding the advent of the coarse and inartistic Reformer; he was the precursor of an epoch when art and religion were represented to be natural enemies, and the spirit of the Vandal desecrated the holy things and places of the Church, in the much-abused name of simplicity in worship. The Puritan looked upon such men as Duerer as aiders and abettors of a cult worse than pagan idolatry and superstition. One of those twisters and distorters of history and fact says: "As Luther preached the Crucified One as the centre of all religious life, whom the Pope had placed in the background, so Duerer also was active as a reformer when he sought to serve with his art, not the Pope and the Church, but Christ as the only Counsellor and Saviour." (*"Illustrated Home Journal."*) There is nothing whatever in Duerer's artistic work to suggest any such design or intention on the part of the great Germano-Hungarian artist. The same authority that thus speaks of Luther and Duerer dwells admiringly on Luther's depictions of the Virgin Mary and the beautiful home life of the house of Joseph in Bethlehem. Why, nothing could be more furiously denounced than the Catholic idea of honor to the Mother of the Saviour was by this same ranting, blasphemous reformer, and none knew it better than his contemporary, Albert Duerer.

Duerer was in, his own way, a great artist, but he had his limitations. Da Vinci, Perugino, Rafael Sanzio, Michael Angelo, were great artists before his time; but they had no limitations—in the artistic sense. Their differing genius knew no bounds. They were "super-men," it is hardly hyperbole to say. And it was the sublime Church that the furious German doctor attacked that gave them the inspiration and the means of developing their thought and employing it to further the work of glorifying God in their superhuman art. D'Aubigne, writing of the influence of the Reformation upon poetry and music and religion, endeavors to obscure the reign of trash in words and flabbiness in melody which the new hymns inaugurated—and which prevails in many places to the present day—and so to becloud the truth as to Albert Duerer. He says, without giving any data whatever to support his contention:

"Albert Duerer was one of those who were attracted by the

Word of Truth, and from that time a new impulse was given to his genius. His masterpieces were produced subsequently to his conversion. It might have been discerned, from the style in which he thenceforward depicted the Evangelists and Apostles, that the Bible had been restored to the people, and that the painter derived thence a depth, power, life and dignity which he never would have found within himself."

The ambiguity which covers all this passage is of a piece with the spirit of uncertainty and dishonesty which the Lutheran campaign almost everywhere produced. The law of self-preservation and self-interest took the place of the law of charity and brotherhood in Christ which is the spirit of the Catholic Church, and which was sedulously taught by the preaching orders all over Europe until the forsworn rebel appeared to banish it from the European stage for many dismal years.

D'Aubigne pretended that a new impulse came into Duerer's life from the constantly varying opinions—no one can truly call them doctrines—of Luther, after he had begun his downward career. A new idea may have come into his head, it may fairly be allowed; society, he saw, was to be henceforth two-sided. His patrons were among the rich, and the rich were the most divided of all. There is no mention in his diary of his having formally thrown in his lot with Luther's party, and the references he makes in the diary to the pretended kidnapping may have been put there to please friends who frequented his studio and conceal his real sentiments. His intimate friend, Pirkheimer, mentions nothing relative to such an important turn in the artist's life. His spouse, Agnes Frey, was a steadfast Catholic and a most imperious partner, and we are inclined to believe that he dreaded her tongue too much to take any step that would draw her wrath upon him. During his sojourn in Venice in 1506 he candidly confessed his insignificance in his own domicile, thus: "Here I am a lord; at home a mere nobody!" This is from one of the letters to his friend, Pirkheimer, reproduced in the "*Taschenbuch*," published on the occasion of his third centenary celebration, held at Nuernberg, in 1828. There are no entries in his diary that bear out the suggestion that he was influenced in his conceptions of art by the tenets of the Lutheran school. On the contrary, he frankly avows the influence wrought on his mind by the painters of the Italian school whom he met, and whose works he was carefully studying while on his travels abroad. Not one of these had any knowledge of Luther or his movement; they would assuredly have laughed at him and it, or despised the whole thing could they have any pre-glimmering of it. Duerer certainly profited by his travels in

Italy, and his technique underwent a change for the better when he returned. This is evidently the sole ground upon which the theory that his mind was affected by the new doctrines as to religion and art that came in when the note of revolt had been sounded in Germany.

The first German painter to break from the traditions of the stiff and stereotyped Byzantine school that prevailed over Europe until the fourteenth century was John Van Eyck. He was a native of the Netherlands and flourished about the middle of that period. Goethe, who was a leviathan in criticism on art and poetry, gives Van Eyck the palm of superiority in the movement away from the rigid, the unsentimental and the sombre in art which began in the thirteenth century—the greatest of all centuries, as Dr. Walsh so triumphantly shows. Of that movement Goethe wrote:

“But now a gladsome feeling of nature breaks suddenly through the air—and that not as a mere imitation of individual reality; it is a genial reveling of the eyesight, as though their first opening upon the sensible world. Apple-cheeked boys and girls, egg-shaped faces of men and women; comfortable-looking old men and women, with curling or flowing beards; the whole race good, pious and cheerful, and although sufficiently individualized, collectively embodied by a delicate and tender pencil. So with respect to the colors. These are cheerful, clear—aye, and powerful, too, without especial harmony, but likewise without gaudiness and always agreeable and pleasing to the eye. . . . We do not hesitate to place our Eyck in the first class of those whom nature has endowed with pictorial faculties. His compositions possess great truth and loveliness. He was a right-thinking and right-feeling artist.”

Van Eyck is regarded as the founder of the Flemish school of painting, and Duerer was one of those whose ideas of art were based largely on what he had learned in that school. It was not until he had learned much therein that he began to travel and observe what other schools—chiefly Italian—had to teach. He confesses much in his diary as to their effect on his imagination and style, as we shall see. But perhaps it may be more in sequential order to put in brief form the causes which led him to bend his steps across the Alps and to the banks of the Tiber, in quest of the inspiration of painting.

It appears from the biographers of the Duerer family that its origin was Hungarian and rural. But Albert's grandfather, Antony Duerer, had no bucolic tastes like his sires', but rather artistic ones. He moved away from the village of Eytas, where they had vegetated, to the town of Julia, and there became a goldsmith's appren-

tice. The custom of "apprenticing" was a great factor in the spreading of art in the Middle Ages—for boys came to the great centres to learn trades and pick up the ideas of the ateliers and readily gave their time to clever artisans or great artists, asking no reward but the privilege of observing the masters' methods of work. At Jula he married and brought up his eldest son, Albert, to his own business, while another son became a priest at Wardein. Albert the goldsmith traveled much in order to improve himself "under the great artists," as the Netherlands goldworkers were called, and, settling down in Nuremberg in the year 1455, married his master's daughter, Barbara Haller. Albert, the great painter, was the second son of the family they reared—eleven sons and seven daughters they numbered, all told. He had been taught a good deal of the goldsmith's art by his father when he discovered that he possessed a greater taste for the arts of drawing and painting. The future great master in these arts relates his early stirrings very modestly and ingenuously in one of the numerous Duerer family "relics" displayed at the centenary. He began the work in the spirit, seemingly, of a man who believed he was discharging a duty to posterity as well as to his forbears and contemporary society:

"I, Albert Duerer, the younger, have put together, out of my father's papers, whence he was, how he came hither and remained here, and ended blessedly. God be gracious to him and us! Amen."

Albert was pious both by heritage and natural bent, but he could be jovial and rollicking whenever care free, as most artists are, but it was his lot to have few such intervals as soon as he became tied to the wheel of the matrimonial car. Of his father and his own early tastes he wrote:

"He had especial pleasure in me, as he saw that I was diligent in learning; therefore he let me go to school, and when I had learned reading and writing he took me out of the school and taught me goldsmith's craft. But now, when I could work neatly, my inclination led me more to painting than to goldsmith's craft; and that I set forth to my father; but he was not well content, for it repented him of the time that I had spent in learning to be a goldsmith; yet he gave way, and on St. Andrew's Day, when 1486 years were reckoned from the birth of Christ, my father bound me to Michael Wohlgemuth for my apprenticeship to serve him for three years. In that time God gave me industry, so that I learned well, but had much to suffer from his men; and when my servitude was ended, my father sent me out, and I remained abroad for four years, until my father called me back; and as in the year 1490, I had gone eastwards away, so now, when 1494 were

reckoned, I came back after Whitsuntide; and when I was come home, Hans Frey dealt with my father and gave me to wife his daughter, by name Maid Agnes, and gave me with her two hundred gulden."

It might be thought, from such a seemingly auspicious beginning, that a rich prize fell into the young artist's hands when he was led to the hymeneal altar by the two considerate parents. But if he ever really got the money into his hands, poor dupe, it was only to see it vanish like conjurers' coins. Dürer's "frau" was like a magnet in regard to the money that her young husband earned. She soon proved herself to be one of the race of Xantippe—a shrew that could never be shamed or tamed, and a miser to whom no glut could bring satiety. That sort of unhappy rich are well depicted in the works of a Dutch master who wrought about Dürer's time, or a little earlier. His picture of "The Misers" helps one to realize in some measure what sort of a lot and a companionship it was to which the great painter was doomed in his Nuremberg home, after he had settled down there with his bride. He had there been accorded the diploma of a master painter by the city authorities, after he had completed his four years of "wanderschaft" studying, as was the habit of the day, the works of the earlier masters of the German and Flemish schools. The work which gained for him the reward he coveted, it is curious to note, was a pagan, not a Christian subject. It was Orpheus in the hands of the furious Bacchantes, after he had incurred their anger. It is remarkable that such should have been the choice of an artist who is so highly lauded as the particular painter of Protestant ideas of Christianity. Orpheus was an artist, too—that is to say, the myth so represents him. But his genius did not avail to save him from the lash of the tarmagant tongue, as cruel to his sensitive mind as the ferocity of the Mœnad Bacchantes. The earlier years of his married life must have been intolerably irksome because of his greedy wife's nagging for money. Many of his letters to his friend Pirkheimer and a few others are filled with dolorous complaints about the small prices paid for his artistic work, the dearth of ultramarine and other indispensable pigments, the scarcity of something to drink at home—for Dürer seems to have been a German in this regard. The naiveté with which these trifles were dilated on and grumbled about reveal a childish sort of mind, but never a sore or resentful one. If he suffered from the acidulated temper of his wife—of which there is not the least doubt he did—he carefully repressed any temptation to exhibit his trouble for the purpose of eliciting the sympathy of his friends.

Although for a long time he did not get extravagant prices for his pictures, the artist's fame was steadily spreading and winning the encomiums of the real cognoscenti. This was strikingly proved by the fact that a Venetian engraver, Marco Antonio by name, had copied some wood cuts of his and passed them off as originals, imitating even Duerer's artistic sign-manual, the professional monogram. The injured artist sought legal redress, and in order to obtain it he was obliged to journey to the great city on the Adriatic, then rising rapidly into artistic fame herself by the works of a noble school of thought and color. Duerer won his case, and his sojourn in Venice brought him much pleasure and considerably widened his circle of friends.

Some notion of the state of relations among painters, musicians and the dilettanti in Italy at that time (A. D. 1506) may be gleaned from Duerer's letters to his friend Pirkheimer. In one dated "the Saturday after Candlemas" he said:

"I wish you were here at Venice; there are so many pleasant companions among the Italians, who, the longer the more, consort with me, so that it touches one's heart; for reasonable, learned, good lute players, fifers, good judges of painting and noble-minded, right virtuous persons do me great honor and friendship. On the other hand, there are also here the falsest, most lying, thievish knaves, as I believe none such exist on the face of the earth; and he who should not know it would think them the pleasantest people in the world. I myself cannot choose but laugh at them when they talk with me; they know that one knows such wickedness of them, but they care nothing about the matter. I have many good friends amongst the Italians, who warn me not to eat and drink with their painters; and indeed many of these are my enemies, and copy my things in the churches and wherever they can get at them, and then revile them, and say they are not after the antique fashion, and therefore not good; but Sambelliny" (Giovanni Bellini, Titian's master, called Zan Belin, in Venetian patois), "he has praised me very highly and before many gentlemen. He would fain have something of mine, and came to me himself and prayed me to do something and he would pay me well for it; and all people tell me he is so worthy a man that I equally value him. He is very old, and is still the best at painting."

This is a characteristic artist's letter, showing at once the pettiness and the magnanimity of the spirit of the studios in that age of Venetian greatness. When Shakespeare speaks of "a super-subtle Venetian," he must have had a good many talks with men who had an intimate knowledge of the Venetian temperament and

the tendency of the wasps of the "Bride of the Sea" to hide under the roses in the gardens of the dream city of the Adriatic.

There is a picture of Rembrandt, painted by himself, showing the great Dutch artist enjoying himself at home, with his "frau," in a little domestic bacchanal festivity. Rembrandt and Duerer were somewhat similar in tastes, it is permissible to conjecture, but their home conditions were much alike. Duerer got no stimulus to do anything great in art at home. His wife was a mere taskmistress, calling out, "like the daughter of the horse-leech, 'Give, give.'" He enjoyed the immunity which his Italian journey afforded; some of his letters to Pirkheimer would suggest that the enjoyment was at times riotous. He shuddered at the thought of the return to the gray skies and monotonous flats of Holland. But when the unwelcome day came he found a royal welcome awaiting him, if not in his own home, at least all over the old city of Nuremberg. He was elected a member of the great Municipal Council—an extraordinary honor, for the city was the capital of a self-governed republic, although a member of the German Federal Empire. Kings and princes paid court to him and sat for their portraits. The Emperor Maximilian appointed him his court painter, at yearly salary of a hundred gulden, besides separate payment for all pictures he bespoke or bought.

As in the case of Henry VIII. and Hans Holbein, there is a tradition relative to Duerer and the Emperor. The painter was drawing on a wall in presence of Maximilian and some courtiers when the ladder began to slip. The Emperor told the noble personage nearest to the ladder to hold it, but this did not suit his ideas of the dignity due to his rank, and so he beckoned to a servant to come forward and hold the unstable foothold. Maximilian was very indignant and told the man of hauteur that Duerer's rank in art raised him far above noble station, inasmuch as he (the Emperor) could transform a peasant into a Count of the Holy Roman Empire, but nobody could transform a nobleman into a Duerer.

It would seem that all the distinction and homage paid to the artist were the cause of a feeling the reverse of delightful to his jealous and avaricious wife. She was unnoticed and unmentioned while he was on that round of pleasure. Therefore, she made up her mind that she would be on the spot if any similar occasion arose. Not for fourteen years did the opportunity arise. In 1500 he, accompanied by his wife, set out on a long journey through the Netherlands. He kept a record of the journey, the places where he stopped and was entertained and honored, and he is very precise in the narrative, setting down each item of expense most

minutely and what it was for. At the same time he mentions some particulars that indicate he was painting and engraving pictures of the Blessed Virgin and the saints and the story of the Passion, just as he did when he started out on his artistic career, and with no reference to Luther and his revolt, save the one that we have noted earlier in order to support the belief that it was insincere. He begins his itinerary with these remarkable entries:

"On Thursday after St. Kilian's Day, I, Albert Duerer, at my own cost and charges, set out for Nuremberg, for the Netherlands, and the same day we passed Erlang, and lay that night at Baiersdorf, and there we spent 3 batzen, less 6 pfennige. Thence I drove to Bamberg and gave the Bishop a painted Marienbild (image of the Blessed Virgin) and copperplates to the value of a gulden; he invited me as his guest, and gave me a *zoll-brief* and three *fürder-briefe*."

The illustrated periodical from which we have quoted some references to Duerer and his work makes a great effort to show that he had no inspiration to paint in the elevated spiritual style that he is said to have acquired late in life until the Pope's ban upon the Bible had been lifted by the Reformation. Nothing could be more at variance with the facts. Duerer had always painted from the Bible, whenever he was so minded—before Luther's time and after it. He painted Madonnas and saints continuously, as his diaries show. The so-called Reformation must have had an adverse effect upon his professional fortunes—to some extent at least. What remains to us, says the biographer of the "*Taschenbuch*," "form only a small part of his productions, the works of the older masters in Germany having suffered cruelly from the insane iconoclastic zeal of the fanatical sects which swarmed at the era of the Reformation."

There is not a sentence to show that he ever formally joined the Reformers, as claimed by some of their publications. His lifelong friend, Pirkheimer, whom we have already quoted, tells about his death, goes no farther than to say that he lived like an honest Christian man and died a most Christian and blessed death, and so he hoped that God would be gracious and merciful to him—a saying that indicated the Catholic beliefs in the reward and punishment of the just and the sinner, respectively, and consequently the belief in Purgatory.

As for his wife, there is no question whatever about her religion. She may have been a shrew, she may have been "*curst*," as the word went in the Middle Age days in the English language—but she did not mix the tenets of her religion as her husband did his pigments. She may have seen and felt and experienced many

griefs and vexations that the wives of popular artists often have to bear in silence. She was a Catholic, and an unwavering one, in a reeling time, and so she has no share in the halo that encircles the brow of her husband.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

CRITICISMS IN KANT.

KANT AND THE DEDUCTION OF THE CATEGORIES.

WHAT is the value of our empirical knowledge? Ever since Des Cartes flung in among the philosophers the apple of discord, the great problem about which the sophists have been wrangling is: What do we really know? All modern philosophy revolves around this problem. The staggering distinction set up by Des Cartes gave a new and completely unexpected turn to metaphysical speculation. The great intellects since his day have tried to grapple with the strange difficulty, each after its own fashion; while among the minor lights of philosophical thought, the Cartesian doubt at once set up a whirligig of theory, and sent feather-weight philosophers whirling into all sorts of eccentric orbits. Alone among philosophers since Des Cartes' day, Leibnitz seems to have maintained his intellectual balance. Locke attempted to give us a keen, but wholly ineffectual anatomy of the human mind. Berkeley pushed the Cartesian postulate to one logical extreme. Hume settled down to a morose, querulous and aggressive skepticism. Then came Kant. He undertook to settle the question for all time, elaborated his abstruse and original theory from the depths of his own inner consciousness, called it the true and only "science of metaphysic," pompously announced that it was a precious treasure which he was going to bequeath as a legacy to posterity—a perfect science of "absolute completeness;" so complete, indeed, that "nothing will remain for (said) posterity, but to arrange everything according to its own views for didactic purposes, without being able to add anything to the subject itself." His own proud manifesto informs us:

"In this work I have chiefly aimed at completeness, and I venture to maintain that there ought not to be one single metaphysical problem that has not been solved here, or to the solution of which the key at least has not been supplied."

Whole swarms of second and third-rate intellects, such as Fichte, Schelling and Hegel in Germany, Hamilton, Menzel and Spencer in Great Britain, as well as others of greater or lesser note in all quarters of the globe, settled down immediately on the Kantian

solution, rejected what did not appeal to them, and carried off what seemed adapted to their own particular needs; so that since Kant's day nearly all philosophy has been more or less a reflex of Kant's central thought. Kant took the opposite extreme from that of Berkeley—and even from that of Des Cartes. He set up the empirical reality as the *summum verum*, utterly regardless of the fact that it was precisely upon this empirical reality that the *Dubito, ergo sum* had cast such grave suspicion. Kant himself fully understood the nature of the problem which he attempted to solve. He fully realized that, in the face of the Cartesian doubt, what men called the empirical reality must have other voucher besides the testimony of the senses. That the impassable chasm which separates consciousness from the external world must be bridged over in some way, before the Cartesian demands are fully satisfied or its doubts set at rest, Kant comprehended at least in a hazy sort of fashion. Nay, even that the testimony of the senses must be properly authenticated before they can be accepted as the final word of human knowledge, he understood, in his lucid intervals of reason, at least. But his perception of this was only intermittent. He dimly perceived that if we are to have knowledge at all of an external world the testimony of consciousness must in some way be linked to the testimony of the senses. But he met the Cartesian problem—as he met all other problems—in crab fashion and indirectly; and he undertook to get across the abyss that divides consciousness from the empirical reality, not by bridging it, but by filling it in—and filling it in with emptiness. Realizing that if our empirical knowledge is to be worth anything it must have other validation than that of the senses, he attempted to fill in the bottomless abyss. And with what? The categories! This feat of metaphysical engineering might well have originated in bedlam. He took the categories of Aristotle and by an extraordinary process of sublimation—at best a mere metaphysical hypothesis—transformed them into forms of the mind or moulds in the understanding prepared there for experience; and these, as so many piles, he attempted to drive into the bottomless gulf. But if the categories are mere forms of the mind—and, consequently, instead of sinking into the abyss, still remain in the mind—how are they going to fill in the abyss or bridge over the yawning chasm? The original problem was: how to pass over from the mind—consciousness—to the external reality? How, then, can the categories advance us a single step if they are merely forms of the mind? Does the mind project them from itself? Are they immaterial antennæ which the mind extends at will and which reach out until they grasp the external not-me and then clasp it in an everlasting

embrace? Are they the drawbridge that is to be let down at will, that stretches across the moat and connects the castle of consciousness with the mainland of the empirical? Possibly. But this fantastic theory is nothing more than mere fancy, and men of thought will require more than Kant's mere word for it. The fact is that men have been so utterly bewildered by the Cartesian challenge regarding the value of all empirical knowledge that they have eagerly grasped at any theory that held out a hope of solution or possessed any semblance of cohesion; and Kant's theory of the categories was the only theory at all on the subject.

All the fourth-rate intellects followed the leadership of Kant; and Kant's solution of the problem being the only one offered to it, the agnostic world has ever since lorded it majestically over the rest of creation, boasting of its intellectual precedence over the rest of mankind, without having even the faintest suspicion as to what was the real nature of the problem which Kant pretended he had solved. Kant made empirical truth the only kind of truth; and to minds which had never grasped the deeper problems of philosophic thought, Kant's standard of truth instantly appealed. To ignorance there could, of course, be no stronger evidence than the evidence of the senses; and when Kant raised the standard of empiricism, the only reality, ignorance seized upon it as a perfectly self-evident proposition. Kant himself, of course, fully comprehended that empirical truth, if it was to withstand the attacks of the skeptics, must have an entirely different warranty from that furnished by the senses. He confessed candidly that to furnish this warranty was by far the most difficult part of his task. It "has," he says, "given me the greatest trouble." But his followers take the problem most jauntily and are perfectly satisfied to accept all empirical knowledge on its own recognizances.

Thus it is that for more than a century Kant's theory of the categories has been a deadly upas tree in the fair garden of philosophy, stifling all healthy inquiry, and leaving the entire field a mere wilderness of sickly, withered, and dead thought. Errors in philosophy are far more injurious to the body politic than even errors in religion. The fact is that, although philosophy is caviare to the general, a sound philosophy is absolutely essential to all healthy thought and right views of life. It is the little leaven that leaveneth the whole mass. If it be pure it will purify all our views of life. This is why Plato and Aristotle rose to such lofty heights of learning—even in spiritual things—without any light from religion. Their light is the only glimmer of truth that comes to us through all the pagan darkness. Quite unobtrusively, sound philosophy lies at the root of all thought, and if the fountain-

head be pure, so also will be the stream which flows from it. The air we breathe is not more unobtrusive; but neither is it more essential than a pure philosophy to life and conduct; and a foul or pestilential atmosphere is not more deathbearing to the human frame than is a false philosophy to the well-being of humanity. Sound philosophy is as essential to a healthy social, political and moral body and to sound and wholesome views of life, as is the blood that courses unseen through the veins, to the glow of health upon the cheek or to the strength of muscle in the limb. Our science, our sociology, our political life, our views of government, but, above all, our ethics are in the last analysis based on the philosophy which we adopt; for philosophy lies at the very basis of thought and goes to the very root of conduct and action. Hence the irreparable injury which Kant's false metaphysic has inflicted on the world. His philosophy has lain like a nightmare over all thought for the last century and a quarter, and with its false principles and halting knowledge has sent the world on a wrong tack. Hence Socialism in its worst form, anarchy, wild theories of government and society are broached, and preached, and philosophized about, and adopted—all, the logical outcome of Kant's speculations. The lone and lonely philosopher may stand on the lofty heights of pure speculation, lifted far above the multitude; but if his thought touches the fundamentals of practical life it will not be many months before the multitudes in the valley below will have incorporated in their own lives and actions the thought which he spoke at first only to the stars, and his philosophy will soon be shaping the conduct of life for millions of men as well as their destiny for the nations. We have only to look around us for ample proof of all this. Thousands who have never heard of a syllogism are acting from a false one. Millions of men who would be wholly incapable of grasping the meaning of a sophism are the victims of numberless fallacies, and their lives, conduct and policy are shaped by the influence of sophisms which they accept as sound principles of reason. Professor De Wulf is right when, in his recent excellent work, he tells us that: "From the calm heights of pure speculation, which are familiar to the philosopher alone, Kant's teachings and theories have also found way into the prefaces of scientific works and into avowedly popularizing treatises; nay, they have even percolated into our modern dramas and romances." So far is Professor De Wulf is right. But we cannot agree with him when he tells us: "We believe that the explanation of the enormous influence of Kantism lies in its remarkable combination of a theoretical subjectivism with a practical dogmatism. The phenomenism which is the last word of the

'Critique of Pure Reason' . . . would never have caught on (!) without the noumenism of the 'Critique of Practical Reason.' Kant's ethics serve as a palliative after his criteriology, for they establish on the basis of sentiment and will the existence of God and of the soul, as well as human liberty and immortality; all of which realities or things-in-themselves the intelligence of man is unable to discover, and which are, nevertheless, the indispensable nourishment of moral and social life. Hence we see it was mainly on the ground of his ethical teaching that the return movement towards Kant was accomplished." With this explanation of the "Zurück zu Kant" we cannot agree. We think men accept what they regard as his inevitable and inexorable conclusions of reason, because in his "Critique of Pure Reason" Kant shrouds his sophisms in such mists of obscurity, that they regard his pronouncements as the thunders of another Sinai, and believe that his quibbling antinomies must be accepted as the iron logic of speculative inquiry from which there is no escape. Men adopt his conclusions because they see no way of refuting his preposterous arguments. They accept his criteriology, which tells them that the objective reality of all that forms the basis of revealed religion is illusory, in the face of pure reason; but they accept all this because they imagine the logic of the categories to be invulnerable; and then, by way of compensation, they atone to themselves for the self-inflicted wrong by accepting without question the logic of the "Critique of Practical Reason"—simply because it restores to them fraudulently what has been fraudulently snatched from them in the realm of speculative reason. But it is from the speculative region—not from the practical—that the doctrines of Kant have filtered down into the walks of practical life. At bottom there can be no difference between speculative and practical truth. One of the hallucinations with which Kant deluded his followers is that a thing may be speculatively false yet practically true. It is one of his famous juggleries. But the practical is always based on the speculative in philosophy; and if the speculative principle be false, the practical application of it cannot be true. We have not hitherto even hinted at the fact that Kant tried in his "Critique of Practical Reason" to make amends for the injustice of the logical *betises* in the "Critique of Pure Reason," for the reason that we have not deemed the "Critique of Practical Reason" as worthy of even a passing notice. As if a conclusion from the emotions and the will could be of any value where the logic of pure reason was magisterially rejected! No; the argument from voluntarism cannot for a moment be regarded as of greater value than the argument from pure logic; and there is no consideration which causes the

gorge to rise so quickly against Kant, or which is so well calculated to cause the mind to revolt against his wanton attempts at dogmatism, as the reflection that he has labored so strenuously to wrest from us the conclusions of reason which are imperative and incontrovertible, and in their stead to force the world to accept the halting conclusions (because of halting premises) from the will alone. The fact is that Kant, like all dictators, assailed in the strongest possible terms what he called the old rotten dogmatism in metaphysic; that this was done merely for the purpose of setting up in its stead his own irrational and stupid dogmatism, and that this was done, too, in the most tyrannical way—under cover of the obscurity of the subject and the abstruseness of the argument by which he pretended to have established his theory. The defense was, however, worse than the original offense. Men might have well known that truth never fears the open day; that it is only error and falsehood that court obscurity; that the man who has an honest thought or an honest argument will never be at a loss for language in which to express it with sufficient clearness so that the world will be able to understand it; that the moment Kant pleaded the obscurity of his subject as his pretext for his want of clearness, he had thereby given the very strongest evidence of bad faith; and that when, like the spiritualistic medium, he invoked the clouds of darkness instead of the clearness of the noonday sun, under cover of which to unfold his deduction of the categories, he only invited in their behalf the very strongest kind of suspicion. It is this obscurity which we shall now endeavor to uncover.

In our last article we saw the meaning of the categories in the Kantian sense of the term, how important and fundamental a place they hold in the entire Kantian system, and how the discovery so-called made by Kant that the categories are not objective, but subjective (that is, that they are forms of the mind or mental moulds of thought to which all experience must conform), was the great Copernican achievement which has revolutionized so completely all philosophy since his day. We have also seen that Kant imagined that, by means of the categories, he had discredited forever the proofs for the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, etc.; that he claimed that, since all knowledge must come from experience and hence be empirical, since all experience and consequently all empirical knowledge can come only through the categories, whose form it must necessarily assume, and since the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, etc., can never come into experience, these truths can, therefore, never become empirical knowledge, and thus can

never become knowledge properly so-called. And we have also seen that, in view of all this, Kant, therefore, imagined that he had said the last word on the question of the knowledge of the great metaphysical problems, and that Kant's agnostic followers have, ever since his day, regarded the case of these problems as closed for all time. But, on the other hand, we have also seen that Kant did not go to the bottom of the question at all, that while claiming that all our knowledge must be empirical knowledge, he made all our empirical knowledge rest at the same time on knowledge that is not and never can be empirical; namely, on the categories; so that instead of establishing empirical knowledge as the only kind of knowledge he did empirical knowledge the very worst kind of service, and even damaged it completely. He claimed two things utterly incompatible with each other. He maintained that all our knowledge must be empirical knowledge, and yet he insisted that all this empirical knowledge must rest on and derive its sanction from knowledge that is *a priori*, namely, the categories, which are not and never can be empirical. In other words, Kant makes the categories vouch for the truth of our empirical knowledge. But who can vouch for the truth of the categories in the Kantian sense; that is, who can show that the categories belong to the mind only, and that they have existence within us at all as forms of the understanding? Yet, according to Kant, it is on the truth of this hypothesis that the truth of all our empirical knowledge rests. Thus, as we have seen, Kant is hoist with his own petard. There is no escape for the devout Kantian from this dilemma.

Possibly, however, some of Kant's followers might, without grasping the problem that is here to be solved, undertake to maintain that empirical knowledge needs no voucher of any kind, that the truth of our sense-experience carries with it its own proof. But to make such an assertion would be to show that the person advancing it had no conception of the real problem at issue, and that he had never heard not only of the serious issues raised by Berkeley, but also of the grave problems raised by Des Cartes—which have sent all philosophy since his day into an entirely new groove. Kant himself, however, fully realized that his empirical knowledge must have proper authentication, and that this authentication must come from Des Cartes' sole established truth—the truth of the thinking subject; and Kant's entire endeavor was to connect the empirical reality with the thinking consciousness. It was for this purpose he established his categories; and it is on the truth of those categories—as he supposed them—he rested the truth of all our empirical knowledge. Incidentally we see, therefore, that the

great difficulty with Kantians is that of following Kant and grasping their master's philosophy as a whole. Be that as it may, Kant has left little room for doubt that he saw that the empirical reality must have proper sanction; that is, that, in the face of the Cartesian problem, it must rest on other knowledge before, from a philosophical point of view, it can be admitted as knowledge at all; and his whole difficulty lies in giving it this sanction. In order to have a proper basis on which to establish the truth of our empirical knowledge he has been forced to maintain that we have an *a priori* knowledge which is independent of and antecedent to the empirical, and that on this, as on a foundation, all our empirical knowledge, that is, the truth of all our experience, rests. This *a priori* knowledge on which all empirical knowledge rests is the categories. His argument is—indeed, it is one of the leading principles of his philosophy—that we actually have cognitions *a priori*. These cognitions *a priori* are the categories. He tells us:

"But though all our knowledge begins with experience, it does not follow that it arises from experience. For it is quite possible that even our empirical experience (sic) is a compound of that which we receive through impressions, and of that which our own faculty of knowledge (incited only by sensuous impressions) supplies from itself, a supplement which we do not distinguish from that raw material until long practice has roused our attention and rendered us capable of separating one from the other."

Kant here gently introduces the question: whether there be a knowledge besides that of experience, and quietly suggests that there really may enter into experience an element "which our own faculty of knowledge supplies from itself." He immediately pursues the question and says:

"It is, therefore, a question which deserves at least closer investigation, and cannot be disposed of at first sight, whether there exists a knowledge independent of experience, and even of all impressions of the senses?"

This broaches the subject fully and directly; and, without even waiting to answer his own question, he at once takes it for granted that it can be answered only in the affirmative, and immediately proceeds to give this knowledge, which is "independent of experience, and even of all impressions of the sense," a name, and to distinguish properly between it and empirical knowledge. He adds:

"Such knowledge is called *a priori*, and distinguished from *empirical* knowledge, which has its sources *a posteriori*, that is, in experience."

The italics here and in what follows are Kant's own. He proceeds to distinguish further and further classify this knowledge.

He tells us that "This term *a priori*, however, is not yet definite enough to indicate the full meaning of our question;" and after showing how "this term is not yet definite enough" to suit him, he adds:

"We shall, therefore, in what follows understand by knowledge *a priori* knowledge which is *absolutely* independent of all experience and not of this or that experience only. Opposed to this is empirical knowledge, or such as is possible *a posteriori* only, that is, by experience."

This *a priori* knowledge, then, is absolutely independent of all experience, and Kant places it in contradistinction to empirical knowledge. It is quite evident, then, that in spite of all Kant's attempts to exclude from knowledge the existence of God and the immortality of the soul, because they can never be met with in experience and consequently can never become empirical, he has, inconsistently enough, laid down as one of his leading principles that there is a knowledge which is not empirical and which is prior to and independent of all experience, and that he has gone even further and made this knowledge the basis on which all empirical knowledge rests. It is not a little strange, too, that this glaring contradiction in his very fundamentals seems hitherto to have been passed over unnoticed by the critics. This is especially strange, since this contradiction of itself overturns Kant's entire system of philosophy, like a house of cards. Kant, however, leaves no room for doubt on this point. He lays down the proposition that:

"We are in possession of certain cognitions *a priori*, and even the ordinary understanding is never without them."

And he proceeds to prove the truth of this proposition. He says:

"All depends here on a criterion, by which we may safely distinguish between pure and empirical knowledge."

These criteria he finds to be necessity and universality. He assures us: "Necessity, therefore, and strict universality are safe criteria of knowledge *a priori*, and are inseparable one from the other."

And he concludes by answering his question in this wise:

"That there really exist in our knowledge such necessary, and in the strictest sense universal, and therefore pure judgments *a priori*, is easy to show. If we want a scientific example, we have only to look to any of the propositions of mathematics; if we want one from the ordinary sphere of the understanding, such a proposition as that each change must have a cause will answer the purpose."

We are not interested here in pointing out Kant's glaring contradiction between this latter statement and that which we have

just quoted above—glaring contradictions in his statements did not annoy Kant very greatly—we are simply showing here that Kant found it essentially necessary to base all our empirical knowledge on knowledge that is not empirical; and that by this *a priori* knowledge he meant real knowledge. And this he tells us plainly in his conclusion—so clearly worded that no one can mistake its meaning.

"It is possible even, without having recourse to such examples in proof of the *reality* (italics ours) of pure propositions *a priori* within our knowledge, to prove their indispensability for the possibility of experience itself, thus proving it *a priori*. For whence should experience take its certainty if all the rules which it follows were always again and again empirical, and therefore contingent and hardly fit to serve as first principles?"

How, in the face of this elaborated proof and clear statement that all our empirical knowledge must rest on knowledge that is not and never can be empirical, Kant could have the consummate effrontery to presume to exclude from knowledge the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the will, solely on the ground that knowledge of these can never become empirical is utterly incomprehensible; and that, at the same time this should be the end and object of his whole work in the "Critique of Pure Reason" is to us one of the greatest curiosities in philosophy, in literature, or indeed in the history of the human mind. And this curious phenomenon is paralleled by another equally strange, viz., that men should call all this effrontery a great revolution in human thought and one of the splendid advances of the human intellect! What wonder that Kant's critics, bewildered by his sophistries and dumbstricken by his amazing conclusions, should run about in every direction and busy themselves with merely secondary and subsidiary questions, such as noumena and phenomena, and overlook completely the great fundamental problem and the great fundamental fallacy! We surmise, however, that the failure of the critics has been due to two distinct yet allied causes arising from the obscurities in which Kant has wrapped his gigantic fallacies, viz., failure to grasp Kant's purpose as a whole and failure to grasp his sophistical argument as one organic whole.

Kant believed, too, that "Not only in judgments, but even in certain concepts, can we show their origin *a priori*." Now, these concepts are the Kantian categories. Kant tells us: "Among the many concepts, however, which enter into the complicated code of human knowledge, there are some which are destined for pure use *a priori*." He says:

"The conditions *a priori* of any possible experience in general are at the same time conditions of the possibility of any objects

of our experience. Now, I maintain that the categories of which we are speaking are nothing but the conditions of thought in any possible experience, as much as space and time contain the conditions of the intuitions which form experience. These categories, therefore, are fundamental concepts by which we think objects of all phenomena in general, and have therefore *a priori* objective validity."

Hence the categories of Kant are the *a priori* knowledge on which all our empirical knowledge is founded and without which we could, according to Kant, have no knowledge at all. That is, the *a priori* knowledge of the categories properly authenticates our empirical knowledge. The question consequently arises naturally and legitimately: Who is going to authenticate this *a priori* knowledge of the categories? It is perfectly plain that unless this knowledge is furnished with the proper credentials we can have no knowledge of any kind whatever, and that the very first duty of Kant was to show the validity of our knowledge of the categories. As we have seen in a former article, Kant's categories differ from those of all other philosophers who preceded him, in the fact that they are derived neither from the object nor from experience, but are supposed to be forms of the understanding itself—mental moulds of knowledge into which experience is poured and whose forms all experience, and consequently all our empirical knowledge, must assume. Consequently the primary duty that devolved on Kant was to show that, as forms of the understanding or moulds of the mind for the reception of experience, they have an actual existence in the mind; in other words, that these categories of his possess objective reality. This Kant seems to have understood fully, and he also seems to have set about it—in some sort of fashion at least; for again and again he attempts to show that his categories, as such, have objective reality. Kant has made such desperate efforts to show that his categories possess objective validity that it is a perfectly legitimate and even interesting inquiry to ask to what extent has he succeeded. If he has failed in these efforts, his preposterous claims in behalf of the sole sovereignty of empirical knowledge become discredited by another and equally conclusive title, and the adventitious semblance of solidity with which he attempted to invest these claims is left without foundation of any kind. We shall endeavor, then, to follow Kant in his proofs of the objective reality of the Kantian categories. In order, however, to begin at the beginning and to clear the question of all confusion, the question must first be asked and answered: What is meant by the objective validity of Kant's categories? This question is of supreme importance, because Kant, with his usual facility in

juggling, has so confused the matter that, as we have seen in the case of his transcendental idealism, he has made the objective validity of the categories mean the exact opposite of what it really means.

It is quite evident that when Kant performed his Copernican feat of transferring the categories from the object or from experience to the mind itself and made them forms of the mind or moulds of the understanding into which experience was to be poured and whose forms experience must necessarily take, before he could make a single step in his new science of metaphysic, it was absolutely necessary that he show clearly that his hypothesis was the correct one, and that the categories, instead of belonging wholly or in part to the object, belonged wholly to the subject and had actual existence as forms of the understanding or mental moulds of knowledge. If all our knowledge, as Kant claimed, must conform to these categories; if nothing can be known except through them; if they even impose their laws on the physical world—as Kant assures us they do—they must be real and actual and not merely imaginary forms of the mind. In other words, they must have a real existence in the mind, and consequently must have an objective validity there. Without this all Kant's conclusions from them were nothing but air castles. This, then, and this only, can be meant when we speak of the objective reality or validity of the Kantian categories; viz., that they have a real existence in the mind—as real as the mind itself—and this, independent of all experience. It is evident, too, that this cannot mean that they exist only when called into action in experience; for this would be equal to saying that they depended on experience for their existence; and Kant's crowning characteristic of his categories is that they are "prior to and independent of all experience," and that they "lie prepared in the mind," awaiting experience. This is a point which we must not lose sight of; for never once does Kant speak of the objective validity of his categories in this sense at all; and, whether with or without design (with deliberate design, we believe), he has led his followers along a false track, which can never bring them to a demonstration of the real existence of his categories, as forms of the mind. It is particularly noteworthy that Kant never faces the question of the objective validity of his categories directly, but always approaches it in crab fashion. Indeed, in the long history of fraud and imposture we know of nothing that can compare with the bold assurance of Kant that he had reached this the pole-star of his philosophical system, if it be not the claim of Dr. Cook that he had reached the full discovery of the North Pole. Instead of manfully facing the task of proving that his categories are wholly subjective, Kant proceeded to raise

a gigantic dust storm to be blown in the faces of those who might have the hardihood to ask for such proof. With his extraordinary capacity for juggling he makes a pretense of satisfying this need for proof without explicitly admitting its necessity; and instead of facing the pressing problem and proving that his categories possessed objective validity, he gave his followers what he pompously styled a "Transcendental Deduction of the Categories." This might have been all very well if, under cover of his high-sounding title, he had proved that his categories had a real existence as forms of the mind, and therefore objective validity; but this seems to have been farthest from Kant's thought; and what he attempted to show, under cover of his sounding phrase, was not the objective validity of his categories at all, but "the manner," as he himself styles it, "how such concepts (the categories) can *a priori* refer to objects." Had Kant stopped even here, the outrage on human reason might have been borne, but he had the even still more audacious effrontery to assure his followers that in attempting to show them "how such concepts can *a priori* refer to objects" he was proving to them the objective validity of his categories. And—what is well calculated to shatter all faith in the powers of human reason—Kant found men who believed him! But lest we might be accused of traducing Kant, we shall quote his own words. After assuring his disciples that a deduction of the categories—and this a transcendental one—was necessary, he explains what he means by this transcendental deduction:

"I call the explanation of the manner how such concepts can *a priori* refer to objects their transcendental deduction, and distinguish it from the empirical deduction which shows the manner how a concept may be gained by experience and by reflection on experience; this does not touch the legitimacy, but only the fact whence the possession of the concept arose."

Kant here informs us that the transcendental deduction of his categories is merely "the explanation of the manner how such concepts can *a priori* refer to objects." But, as has been said, this is not what the requirements of the case called for from Kant at all. What was needed—what is still needed—what will ever be needed—and, what never has been given by Kant or any of his disciples—is the proof that his categories belong exclusively to the subject; that they have a real existence as forms in the understanding; that this view is the correct one instead of that of Aristotle, or that of Locke or Hume. That was the crying need; but it is manifest that Kant's intention was to evade rather than satisfy it, and to confuse rather than clear up the issue. What

Kant attempts to do—instead of proving that his categories have a real existence as forms of the mind or mental moulds of thought—is to show “how these concepts can refer to objects.” Had he rested satisfied with this no one would have greatly complained. It would be manifest that he declined to furnish proof and wanted to be regarded as a dictator whose mere *ipse dixit* sufficed. But in order to give his transcendental deduction of the categories an appearance of having proved his theory, he adds: “This does not touch the legitimacy, but only the fact whence the possession of the concept arose.” Now, it is precisely “the fact whence the possession of the concept arose,” that is, called for; and showing that “the concepts refer to objects” is by no means showing “the fact whence the possession of the concepts arose.” Aristotle held that “the fact from which the possession of the concept (or category) arose” was the object itself. Locke believed that “the fact from which the possession of the concept arose” was experience and reflection on experience, while Kant maintains that “the fact from which the possession of the concept arose” is a form in the understanding itself. Consequently, to show how these concepts can refer to objects is by no means to show which of these three theories—Kant’s theory, or Locke’s theory, or Aristotle’s theory—is the correct one; or whether any of all three is correct. It certainly cannot, by any force of violent wrenching or straining, be made to do duty for proof of the objective validity of the categories in Kant’s sense of the term; and this is what the requirements of the case demand. But Kant evidently wanted to confuse matters and to raise a blinding dust in order to persuade his followers that he had shown the objective validity of his categories when he had merely shown what no one had ever doubted or questioned for a moment. The juggler must keep two balls in the air when he wishes to impose on his audience, and Kant, like him, must raise a double issue and confound two essentially different features—the original source of the categories or their objective validity, and their relation to objects. But these two differ *toto calo* from each other, and to prove—even had Kant proved it—that they “refer to objects” is by no means to prove the objective validity of his categories. The fact is that Kant seems to have been fully aware of the hopelessness of the task which he had set himself and which his system of philosophy demanded, viz., that of proving that his categories are forms of the mind, and that as such they have objective validity; consequently, he resorted to all sorts of expedients to cover up the absence of proof. The moment Kant is confronted with the problem of proving the truth of *his* categories he at once becomes confused and even

desperate. He stops at no chicanery. He shrinks from no trickery. He is on every side of the same question, and does not hesitate to use for argument the very principles he is rejecting. Even prevarication has no difficulty for him, and he does not scruple to impress falsehood and deceit into his thesis, as it stands in need of them. We have already quoted instances of this in our first article, and we shall repeat some of them here; for it is here they especially apply.

In the very preface to the first edition of his famous work he confesses that the "Deduction of the Pure Concepts of the Understanding (that is, the categories) have given me the greatest trouble;" and we can well believe it. Again in the body of the work itself he tells us:

"The deduction of the categories is beset with so many difficulties and obliges us to enter so deeply into the first grounds of the possibility of our knowledge in general, that I thought it more expedient, in order to avoid the lengthiness of a complete theory, and yet to omit nothing in so essential an investigation, to add the following four paragraphs with a view of preparing rather than instructing the reader. After that only I shall in the third section proceed to a systematical discussion of these elements of the understanding. Till then the reader must not allow himself to be frightened by a certain amount of obscurity which at first is inevitable on a road never trodden before, but which, when we come to that section, will give way, I hope, to a complete comprehension."

We do not quite understand what Kant means by "preparing rather than instructing the reader" in this quotation, but judging from the context we imagine it means a species of metaphysical third degree, after which the victim will gladly cry "Amen" to any conclusion whatever. Instruction or enlightenment, as Kant has well said, there is not. Nevertheless, we believe that if a man has any truth to teach—even in metaphysic—he can make himself understood, and there is no need of an appeal to obscurity.

Previously he had told us:

"Before the reader has made a single step in the field of pure reason, he must be convinced of the necessity of such a transcendental deduction, otherwise he would walk on blindly, and, after having strayed in every direction, he would return only to the same ignorance from which he started. He must at the same time perceive the inevitable difficulty of such a deduction, so that he may not complain about obscurity where the object itself is obscure, or weary too soon with a removal of obstacles."

It is Kant himself, however, that has been "straying in every direction," and who, we are sorry to say, has strayed even from

the path of strict truth. So great was his difficulty and so profound the obscurity of the region in which he found himself that the lie logical—or the fallacy—did not prove equal to the requirements, and Kant found it necessary to have recourse to the lie categorical—or the falsehood. We have already noticed in our first article the Kantian fable regarding the definitions of the categories; but it should not be omitted here. If Kant was going to give us a transcendental or other deduction of these categories; if he was going to explain their meaning and origin; if they are central and pivotal in all philosophy and all knowledge; if such momentous issues hung upon a proper understanding of them; obviously, the very first duty of the philosopher who raised them to so high a rank and endowed them with such transcendental importance was to give an intelligible definition of each one of them. If the categories were to be the chief corner-stone of a new metaphysical edifice which was to supersede all previous structures; if they were to revolutionize all our knowledge as completely as the Copernican theory revolutionized our astronomy, men should be able to understand what was the nature of the new agency which was to supplant the old and seal up forever, as useless and misleading, those volumes of knowledge which the world had hitherto regarded as its most precious treasures. There should be no mystery about the nature of the magic instrument which was to accomplish such wonders. The categories were to supersede all knowledge of the existence of God, the freedom of the will and the immortality of the soul; and men were asked to barter not only their faith and supernatural knowledge regarding these things, but also all that reason itself, with all the emphasis of an apodictic certainty, had taught them on the subject—and all this for their faith in the Kantian category. It was, therefore, a primary duty that the chief promoter and author of the new knowledge should give the world some account of the nature of the instruments for which they were to exchange all their long-cherished, fundamental truths. Manifestly the categories should be properly defined; and manifestly Kant fully realized his obligatory duty in this regard. But in the whole history of philosophy there is nothing that can compare in infamy with the following combination of statements. In the first and second editions of the "Critique of Pure Reason" the following apparently frank statement appears:

"I intentionally omit here the definition of these categories, though I may be in possession of them. In the sequel I shall dissect these concepts so far as is sufficient for the purpose of the method which I am preparing. In a complete system of pure

reason they might justly be demanded, but at present they would make us lose sight of the principal object of our investigation by rousing doubts and suspicions which, without injury to our essential object, may well be relegated to another time. The little I have said ought to be sufficient to show clearly that a complete dictionary of these concepts with all requisite explanations is not only possible, but easy."

This seeming candor and promise for the future would be all very well in its way had it only been fulfilled; but when that "another time" comes to which these definitions had "been relegated," Kant has an entirely different story to tell—a story so damning that he suppresses it wholly in the second edition (and consequently in subsequent editions). It is:

"When representing the table of the categories we dispensed with the definition of every one of them, because at that time it seemed unnecessary for our purpose, which concerned their synthetic use only, and because entailing responsibilities which we were not bound to incur (?). This was not a mere excuse, but a very important prudential rule, viz., not to rush into definitions and to attempt completeness or precision in the definition of a concept, when one or other of its characteristic marks is sufficient, without a complete enumeration of all that constitute the whole concept."

Compared with the preceding statement, this shows to what shifts and depths of deceit Kant could descend, when it suited his purpose; but more follows. He immediately adds:

"Now, however, we can perceive that this caution had even a deeper ground, namely, that we could not have defined them even if we had wished; for if we remove all conditions of sensibility, which distinguish them as the concepts of a possible empirical use, and treat them as concepts of things in general (therefore as of transcendental use), nothing remains but to regard the logical function in judgments as the conditions of the possibility of the things themselves, without the slightest indication as to where they could have their application and their object, or how they could have any meaning or objective validity in the pure understanding, apart from sensibility."

This shows to what desperate straits Kant was reduced and how clearly he perceived that the only way in which he could get his new Copernican theory of the categories imposed on the world was by resorting to deceit, and then hiding his failure under cover of the abstruse nature of his problem. There is, however, just one way to unmask Kant, and that is to follow him into the depths of the darkness and obscurity which he voluntarily courted

and expose even there the fraud and trickery to which he has confessedly resorted. Let us pursue him even still further into this "obscurity" on a road never before trodden and uncover his methods still further.

We have seen that the primary duty that devolved on Kant was to prove the objective validity of his categories; that is, that they have a real existence as forms of the understanding. We have also seen how Kant has tried to make his transcendental deduction of these categories pass muster—in the darkness—for proof of their objective validity. But the further we follow him the more evident does it become that Kant, haunted by the impossibility of his task of proving the objective reality of his categories, grasps, like a drowning man, at any straw, and is ready to call anything and everything "proof" of the "objective validity of" his categories. Nay, when he emerges finally from the depths of obscurity which he so courted, with the transcendental deduction waving proudly in the air as the trophy of his victory, we find that he has not given us either a transcendental deduction, nor a metaphysical deduction, nor an empirical deduction, nor a deduction of any kind whatsoever; but that, like all men traveling in the darkness, he has ricocheted around and around in a circle, and ended precisely where he began—by showing that there is a "relation" between the categories and the objects of experience. The full value of this momentous discovery can be appreciated when we say that the fact of such a "relation" has never been questioned by any one; that it is the fact of this "relation" which centuries ago sent Aristotle in search of the different categories, and set him to inquire how many of these categories he could find in this "relation;" that how these categories arise, what is their origin—since they ever enter into all our knowledge—whether they are to be attributed to the subject or to the object, or to both, or whether they are mere abstractions from experience, are the questions which have arisen from this evident "relation," and that have even sent Kant himself in search of the *origin* of these categories and the *manner* of their "relation to objects of experience." This relation of the categories to the objects of experience had ever been regarded by philosophers so manifest that there was no denying it. It was unquestionable, unmistakable, obtrusive and aggressive; it would not down. And now Kant tells us that he has proved there exists such a relation, and that in proving this he has proved the objective validity of his categories! This may seem incredible to those who have not taken the pains to understand Kant; but his own words can hardly be gainsaid when he tells us the conclusion of his investigations:

"This, and no more than this, we were called upon to prove in the transcendental deduction of the categories, namely, to make the relation of the understanding to our sensibility, and through it to all objects of experience, that is the objective validity of the pure concepts of the understanding, conceivable *a priori*, and thus establish their origin and truth."

Doubtless this extraordinary sentence—extraordinary in every way—will need translation into English before the ordinary reader can grasp its full meaning. In plain language it means—when properly analyzed—(1) that the transcendental deduction of the categories—which, Kant says, "gave him the greatest trouble"—consists in making the relation of the understanding to all objects of experience, conceivable *a priori*. (2) It further tells us that this relation is effected by means of our sensibility, which is the connecting link between our understanding and the objects of experience. (3) It tells us that by the objective validity of the categories is meant this relation of the understanding to all objects of experience by means of our sensibility. (4) It further tells us that the making of this relation of the understanding to all objects of experience, conceivable *a priori*, actually proves the objective validity of the pure concepts of the understanding; that is, of the categories; and (5) deponent further saith that this entire process; videlicet, the making of this relation of the understanding to the objects of experience—by means of our sensibility—conceivable *a priori*, actually establishes the origin and truth of the categories themselves.

Now, this is Kant's conclusion after passing through the troublous region. And thus he proves the transcendental deduction of the categories! And thus he proves the objective validity of the Kantian categories as actually existing forms of the understanding! And this is the great treasure which he has left to posterity! But (1) that there exists a relation between the understanding and the objects of experience is a proposition which no man in his senses ever undertook to question. That this relation extends to all objects of experience no one ever questioned or ever will. That this relation is conceivable *a priori* and *a posteriori* no one whose mind was not completely muddled by perplexity of some kind would have even broached; for this relation is not only conceivable both *a priori* and *a posteriori*, but is actual and real, and no man may undertake to gainsay it. (2) That this relation between the understanding and the objects of experience is effected by means of our sensibility, which is the connecting link between them, may pass without challenge; although other philosophers would express it in more logical form. But (3) that this relation

between the understanding and all the objects of experience—even when effected by means of our sensibility—that this should be made to pass muster for a definition of the objective validity of the Kantian category, or that the two notions are at all interchangeable, is one of those reckless assertions which Kant was wont to make when he found himself “beset with difficulties.” The objective validity of the Kantian categories means—and it can mean nothing else—that these categories have a real existence in the mind as forms of the understanding. This is what distinguishes them from the categories of Aristotle as well as those of Locke; and the proof of the objective validity of the Kantian categories must consist in showing that they have a real existence in the mind as forms of the understanding. In no other way can Kant or any one else prove their objective validity. Hence (4) when Kant has the effrontery to assert that, when he has made it conceivable *a priori* that between the understanding and all the objects of experience there exists a relation which is effected by our sensibility, he has thereby proved the objective validity of his categories, he is taking advantage of the obscurity of his problem to foist upon the world wild, reckless and false statements. How the simple fact that the relation of the understanding to the objects of experience becomes conceivable *a priori* can prove that Kant’s categories really exist in the mind as forms of the understanding, is one of those wild, random, reckless statements that surpass all human understanding. (5) That to make conceivable *a priori* the existence of a relation between the understanding and the objects of experience—even when this relation is effected by means of our sensibility—could “establish the truth” of the Kantian categories, any more than it can “establish the origin and truth” of the categories in the Lockian sense or in the Aristotelian sense, is so plainly absurd that we need not dwell upon it here. All that it can possibly mean is that our minds have a capacity for knowledge of external objects..

The fact seems to be that Kant became so completely bewildered and confused when he entered upon the proof of his Copernican hypothesis that he lost sight of his bearings completely; although he never seems to have lost his audacious effrontery. He clearly enough perceived what the requirements of his newly assumed position demanded; and he seems to have fully realized the utter impossibility of fulfilling these requirements; but he also seemed determined to brazen it out boldly to the end, in the hope that, in the darkness and obscurity, his reckless statements might pass for sound reasoning.

Our space forbids us to go into the extraordinary arguments

on which he bases his extraordinary conclusions that the *a priori* possibility of the categories is a proof of their real existence as forms of the mind. But we may gather Kant's own real opinion of the conclusiveness of his arguments from a few facts. In the first edition of his famous work he devotes thirty pages to the deduction of the categories, and at their close he tells us: "On this ground, as the only possible one, our deduction of the categories has been carried out." Nevertheless, in spite of this emphatic statement, when he comes to prepare a second edition, this "only possible ground on which our deduction of the categories" can be "carried out," is completely abandoned; or, as Max Muller puts it: "In the second edition . . . the Deduction of the Categories is much changed." This is not the only evidence, however, that Kant had little faith in his own logic, and that throughout the deduction of the categories he was merely playing a game of bluff or blind man's buff. He talks very courageously and confidently about the success of his new Copernican discovery; but it is only too evident that at heart he has only the gravest kind of misgiving regarding the real success of his wonderful achievement. As he gropes his way at haphazard through the obscurity of "the never-before-trodden paths" he keeps up a brave whistling; but this is evidently for the purpose of keeping up his own courage. It is amusing to place in juxtaposition his magisterial dogmatism and his trembling hesitancy, his extravagant assurances that his conclusions are nothing short of apodictic, and the tell-tale expressions which betray his mistrust that everything was not exactly right. Our space will permit us to glance merely at a few. In his preface to the first edition he tells us with the most serene confidence:

"I flatter myself that I have thus removed all those errors which have hitherto brought reason into conflict with itself. I have not evaded its questions by pleading the insufficiency of human reason, but I have classified them according to principles, and, after showing the point where reason begins to understand itself, solved them satisfactorily."

Here at least Kant seems to have been satisfied with the result of his labors; and, in the first flush of imaginary success, he goes still further.

"In this work," he adds, "I have chiefly aimed at completeness, and I venture to maintain that there ought not to be one single metaphysical problem that has not been solved here, or to the solution of which the key at least has not been supplied."

In his overweening confidence he becomes even rash in his statements. He tells us that "two essential demands—certainty and clearness—may very properly be addressed to an author who

ventures on so slippery an undertaking." The term "slippery" is certainly very happily chosen; and Kant pleads guilty to a lack of clearness. But with regard to certainty he puts on a bold front. "First," he tells us, "with regard to certainty. I have pronounced judgment against myself by saying that in this kind of inquiries it is in no way permissible to propound mere opinions, and that everything looking like a hypothesis is counterband, that must not be offered for sale at however low a price, but must, as soon as discovered, be confiscated."

Here, then, the note of certainty even to cocksureness is unmistakable, and everything like hypothesis is "counterband." But, utterly forgetful of all this, after a brief space, he admits that his theory of the categories was not even a hypothesis, but a mere experiment! He says that, encouraged by the example of mathematics and natural science, which, at a single bound, became real sciences, he was led "to make the experiment . . . of imitating them." "Hitherto," he says, "it has been supposed that all our knowledge must conform to the objects." He determined, therefore, that "the experiment ought to be made, whether we should not succeed better with the problems of metaphysic, by assuming that the objects must conform to our mode of cognition. This is singular language on a subject where not only experiment, but even hypothesis "must be counterband." Instead, therefore, of being driven by the overwhelming force of reason to his theory of the categories, the Kantian categories—such as they are—are a mere haphazard experiment. Of this metaphysical adventure he tells us:

"This experiment succeeds as well as we could desire, and promises to metaphysic, in its first part, which deals with concepts *a priori*, of which the corresponding objects may be given in experience, the secure method of a science."

Kant, however, seems to have at last realized the gross inconsistency of these statements and in his preface to the Second Edition endeavors to extricate himself in this childish fashion:

"I also propose in this my preface my own view of metaphysics, which has so many analogies with the Copernican hypothesis, as an hypothesis only, though in the 'Critique' itself it is proved by means of our representations of space and time, and the elementary concepts of the understanding, not hypothetically, but apodictically"(!)

In other words, all hypothesis were to be "counterband;" but as Kant's theory happens to be a mere hypothesis, he assures us, it is only in his preface that it is "an hypothesis," and that "in the 'Critique' itself" it is proved, and proved "not hypothetically, but

apodictically!" This puerile explanation of the introduction of an hypothesis, where everything of the kind was to be "counterband," must yield in curiosity, however, to the new "apodictic" feature which he here introduces. We are assured that in the "Critique" itself his theory "is apodictically proved." Now, an apodictic proof is one that is necessarily certain and does not admit of question. We can, however, judge of the "apodictic" nature of Kant's proof from the fact that it has been repeatedly challenged from the very start, and since then over and over again. And how "apodictic" Kant himself really regarded it we may learn from Kant himself. Referring to these famous "apodictic" proofs, he tells us:

"But in order to prevent any unnecessary weakening of these arguments, he (the author) may be allowed to point out himself certain passages which, though they refer to collateral subjects only, might occasion some mistrust, and thus counteract in time the influence which the least hesitation of the reader in respect to these minor points might exercise with regard to the principal object."

Again he tells us of his deduction of the categories:

"I therefore warn the reader, in case my subjective deduction should not produce that complete conviction which I expect, that the objective (!) deduction, in which I am here chiefly concerned, must still retain its strength."

These statements are not calculated to inspire unquestioning confidence in Kant's own faith in the "apodictic" certainty of his proofs and conclusions. Nor is the following:

"If people, however, should prefer to call in question all the former proofs of the *Analytic*, rather than allow themselves to be robbed of their possessions of the value of the proofs on which they have rested so long, they surely cannot decline my request when I ask them to justify themselves at least on this point."

And where he resorts to the theory of his phenomena as distinguished from the noumena—a subsidiary theory which he introduces to meet the hiatus in the proofs for his theory of the categories—he says: "If, after all these arguments, anybody should still hesitate to abandon the purely transcendental use of the categories, let him try an experiment with them for framing any synthetic proposition." This is very strange language about conclusions that we have been told are "proved, not hypothetically, but apodictically." But the climax comes when, after heroically cleaving his thirty pages of a pathway "beset with difficulties," through a region "never trodden before," he declares solemnly: "On this ground, as the only possible one, our deduction of the categories has been carried out;" and then—as we have seen above—when he came to revise

his famous work for the second edition, these thirty pages of "apodictical" proof are wiped out as though they never existed; or, as Max Muller puts it: "The Deduction of the Categories is much changed, as seen in Supplement XIV." All this shows us what was Kant's real opinion of the "apodictic" character of his conclusions; and it also shows us incidentally how necessary it is to scrutinize closely and analyze carefully every statement and argument which Kant advances.

Such, then, is Kant's own opinion regarding his deduction of the categories, about which in a moment of gushing enthusiasm, he assures us, he has proved them, "not hypothetically, but apodictically." What Kant has really accomplished can be seen from a close scrutiny of his deduction. Many pages, however, would be required to do ample justice to this portion of the subject, and we can do little more than here indicate in outline Kant's failure. Let us keep in mind meanwhile that the primary duty that necessarily devolved on Kant was to show not this, or that, or the other thing, but that his categories are real and actual forms of the mind, and thus that they have objective reality; and that without this his whole chain of reasoning is but a rope of sand. It is only by keeping this in mind that we shall be able to comprehend the full extent of Kant's failure. Instead of proving this—or, indeed, attempting to prove it—he claims that when he has shown that "the categories are conditions of thought in any possible experience" he has thereby given us a transcendental deduction of them, and therefore shown that they possess objective validity. In other words, Kant imagines that when he has shown us that the categories refer to objects of experience he has shown that they possess objective validity—as real forms of the understanding. Such a claim, however, is fatuity itself. It needs no proof to show the utter absurdity of Kant's position here. All that is necessary is to recall the fact that it is precisely this reference of these categories to objects of experience that can neither be denied nor disproved. Incontrovertible facts never stand in need of proof. And than the reference of the categories to objects of experience, there is nothing in science or philosophy more universally admitted. It was this reference of the categories to all objects of experience that gave Aristotle pause more than twenty-two hundred years ago. It was the curious phenomenon of meeting with the categories everywhere that set him to investigate their nature, to calculate their number, and to investigate their origin. It was the very fact that he could not separate them from the knowledge of the objects of experience that caused him to speculate whether they belonged to the mind, to the objects, or to the mind and objects

combined. It was because of the fact that the categories are found everywhere "referring to objects" that he at last settled down to the conclusion that they belonged to the objects which we meet with in experience. It was this same fact—the necessary reference of the understanding to objects of experience, and this persistent assumption of the form of the categories—that led Locke into a similar speculation. Everywhere and invariably that we find experience of objects there we find the categories in one form or other—and often in all forms. Hence the very fact that started the problem of the categories was their inseparable connection with the mind and its objects, and all Kant's labor was a much ado about nothing. It was the crying fact that they referred to objects which started philosophers on their fruitless quest as to their origin, and which led them to investigate the reason why all knowledge assumes these forms. Is the cause in the objects or in the mind? That was the question to be solved. How do they refer to objects?—not that they refer to objects, was the problem to be solved. The latter was an ever-present truism. Hence the most elaborate piece of folly that any philosopher could devise was to undertake to prove that "the categories are conditions of thought in any possible experience." For it is the incontrovertibility of that selfsame proposition that lies at the very basis of all inquiry concerning the categories. What, then, must be thought of Kant's famous summary—quoted above—of the results of his deduction of the categories, in which he tells us: "This, and no more than this, we were called upon to prove in the transcendental deduction of the categories, namely, to make the relation of the understanding to our sensibility, and through it to all objects of experience, that is the objective validity of the pure concepts of the understanding, conceivable *a priori*, and thus to establish their origin and their truth?" What must be thought of the assertion?

"Now, I maintain that the categories of which we are speaking are nothing but the conditions of thought in any possible experience. These categories, therefore, are fundamental concepts by which we think objects of all phenomena in general, and have therefore *a priori* objective validity. This is exactly what we wished to prove."

Or of this?

"Such concepts of objects in general must form conditions *a priori* of all knowledge produced by experience, and the objective validity of the categories, as being such concepts *a priori*, rests on this very fact that by them alone, so far as the form of thought is concerned, experience becomes possible."

But thus it is throughout with Kant's proof of the objective validity of the categories. He never attempts to show that they

have a real actual existence as forms of the understanding, but tries to gloss over the failure by pretending that when he has asserted that the categories refer to the objects of experience he has thereby proved their objective validity. He tells us:

"It is therefore the *possibility of experience* (italics Kant's) which alone gives objective reality to all our knowledge *a priori*. . . . Experience depends, therefore, on *a priori* principles of its form, that is, on general rules of unity in the synthesis of phenomena, and the objective reality of these (rules) can always be shown by their being the necessary conditions in all experience."

Here Kant makes the objective validity of the categories depend on the fact that they are necessary conditions in all experience; but sensible people will understand what are the facts in the case, in spite of all desperate efforts to confuse the meaning of a plain problem. And these facts are that *nolens volens* the categories enter into conditions of thought in all our knowledge; and that all Kant's frantic efforts to prove this is simply an attempt to prove what can by no possibility be denied as a fact. They will further understand that this presence of the categories, as conditions of experience, is very far from proving what Kant must prove before his theory is accepted, viz., that saying they are conditions of thought in all experience is the same as proving that the categories have an actual existence in our minds as forms of the understanding independent of all experience. That they are "conditions of thought" does not make for Kant's theory of the categories one iota more than it makes for the theory of Aristotle or for the theory of Locke. It constitutes the very data in the problem to be solved.

Indeed Kant gives away his whole contention when he comes to explain the ground of his distinction of all subjects into phenomena and noumena. We have already called attention to Kant's peculiar tendency to argue from any side and from all sides of any question. Here it is supreme in all its audacious and mendacious effrontery. We have seen that the categories, according to Kant, are actual forms of the mind or mental moulds of thought, and that, according to him, they have an existence in the mind independent of and antecedent to all experience. This was at the beginning—when he first launched his hypothesis. He wished to have this principle stand forth in clear light, in contradistinction to the theories of Locke and Aristotle; and there was no doubt about the genuineness of its ring. This was the great Copernican theory which revolutionized all philosophy and all human knowledge. Then, the characteristic features of the categories were that they had real existence as forms of the understanding, that they

borrowed nothing whatever from experience, that they were prior to and independent of experience, and that they lay prepared in the mind waiting for experience. But as the theory progresses and all this is crying out for necessary proof, Kant at once begins to recede little by little from this bold stand. He merges the objective validity of these categories in the transcendental deduction of them. He tries to make it appear that when he says that they are necessary accompaniments to all thought and all knowledge, that he has thereby proved their objective validity; although this does not count one single step in advance for his theory more than for the opposing theories. And finally he, wittingly or unwittingly, confesses flatly that, in spite of all his boastings and bravado, these categories are neither prior to nor independent of experience, but that apart from experience they have no existence at all, and consequently have no objective validity. Thus they fall with a crash from their lofty and independent height. Apart from experience they are really nothing! This is such a shock—after all the loud blare of trumpets that ushered in the categories—that the reader who grasps it fully cannot believe his senses and is apt to read the lines over and over again before admitting the damning evidence that makes Kant the greatest of all quacks and impostors. But let Kant speak for himself.

"All concepts," he tells us, "therefore, and with them all principles, though they may be possible *a priori*, refer, nevertheless, to empirical intuitions, that is to data of possible experience. Without this they can claim no objective validity, but are a mere play, whether of the imagination or of the understanding with their respective representations."

And again:

"Their use and their relation to objects can nowhere be found except in experience, of which these concepts contain *a priori* the (formal) possibility only."

How are the mighty fallen! and he adds:

"That this is the case with all categories and with all the principles drawn from them becomes evident from the fact that we could not define any one of them without at once having recourse to the conditions of sensibility or the form of phenomena, to which, as their only possible objects, these categories must necessarily be restricted, it being impossible, if we take away these conditions, to assign to them any meaning, that is, any relation to an object, or to make it intelligible to ourselves by any example what kind of thing could be intended by such concepts."

Again, commenting on his inability to define the categories, he says: "Now, however, we can perceive that this caution had a deeper

ground, namely, that we could not have defined them, even if we had wished; for if we remove all conditions of sensibility, which distinguish them as concepts of a possible empirical use, and treat them as concepts of things in general (therefore as of transcendental use), nothing remains but to regard the logical function in judgments as the condition of the possibility of the things themselves, without the slightest indication as to where they could have their application and their object, or how they could have any meaning or objective validity in the pure understanding, apart from sensibility."

Great was the fall, my countrymen! These are the selfsame categories, which apart from sensibility and experience were totally independent and constituted an altogether great and important branch of human knowledge—our knowledge *a priori*—so great, indeed, that it revolutionized all philosophy and formed a safe foundation on which all our empirical knowledge, according to Kant, must rest. But the end is not yet. Kant further tells us:

"It seems to be something strange and even illogical that there should be a concept which must have a meaning, and yet is incapable of any explanation. But the case of these categories is peculiar, because it is only by means of the general sensuous condition that they can acquire a definite meaning and a reference to any objects. That condition being left out in the pure category, it follows that it can contain nothing but the logical function by which the manifold is brought into a concept. By means of this function, that is the pure form of the concept, nothing can be known and distinguished as to any object belonging to it, because the sensuous condition under which alone objects can belong to it, has been removed. Thus we see that the categories require, besides the pure concept of the understanding, certain determinations of their application to sensibility in general (schemata)."

And Kant concludes:

"With all this it remains perfectly undetermined what kind of things they may be with regard to which we have to use one rather than another of these functions, so that without the condition of sensuous intuition, for which they supply the synthesis, the categories have no relation to any definite object, and consequently have not the validity of objective concepts."

Here, then, are categories which loomed up so large on the philosophic horizon and which were independent of all experience; nay, the very things that made experience possible, now made by their creator wholly dependent on experience; for they are dependent on sensibility, and sensibility is only a link in the chain of experience. Without this sensibility and their relation to it

"they have not the validity of objective concepts." In other words, of themselves they have no objective validity. Nay, he tells us that the "pure intuition can receive its object, and with it its objective validity, by an empirical intuition only." Even further explicitness is vouchsafed us—and this where we least expect it—when he tells us: "All concepts . . . and with them all principles, though they may be possible *a priori*, refer, nevertheless, to empirical intuitions. . . . Without this they can claim no objective validity, but are a mere play, whether of the imagination or of the understanding with their respective representations." Two things are noteworthy here: (1) that Kant claims that without empirical intuition the categories can have no objective validity; that is, they are, in other words, non-existent—in spite of the resplendent figure which they at first made on the horizon of the Kantian theory as totally independent of all experience. At first they were independent of experience. They were necessary for experience. There could be no experience without them. But now the tables are completely turned. They are wholly dependent on experience; experience is necessary for their very existence; and without experience there are no categories. And (2) that the objective validity of the categories, which—as we have admonished our readers to keep steadily in mind—consists in their real existence as forms of the understanding, is here made by Kant identical with the receiving of its object by an empirical intuition. He says "the pure intuition can receive its object, and with it its objective validity, by an empirical intuition only." But Kant does not stop here. He tells us plainly that it is only in experience we can have any understanding whatever of the meaning of the categories; although we had already been told most emphatically that they are antecedent to and wholly independent of all experience. He says that "if we take away these conditions of sensibility," that are a necessary link in experience, "it is impossible to assign to them (the categories) any meaning, that is, any relation to an object (consequently their own objective validity) or to make it intelligible to ourselves by any example what kind of thing could be intended by such concepts."

Enough, we think, has been said to show that Kant has wholly misconceived the nature of the problem which he was called upon to solve in proving the objective validity of the categories. Perhaps it would be nearer the truth to say that Kant fully conceived the nature of the problem, but that it was his interest, his purpose and his policy to evade it altogether.

SIMON FITZSIMONS.

CONSTITUTIO APOSTOLICA

DE NOVA PSALTERII IN BREVIARIO ROMANO DISPOSITIONE.

PIUS EPISCOPUS

SERVUS SERVORUM DEI.

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

DIVINO afflatu compositos Psalmos, quorum est in sacris litteris collectio, inde ab Ecclesiae exordiis non modo mirifice valuisse constat ad fovendam fidelium pietatem, qui offerebant *hostiam laudis semper Deo, id est, fructum labiorum confitentium nomini eius* (Hebr. 13, 15); verum etiam ex more iam in vetere Lege recepto in ipsa sacra Liturgia divinoque Officio conspicuam habuisse partem. Hinc illa, quam dicit Basilius, nata *Ecclesiae vox* (Homil. in Ps. 1 n. 2), atque psalmodia, eius *hymnodiae filia*, ut a decessore Nostro Urbano VIII. appellatur (Bulla "Divinam psalmodiam"), *quae canitur assidue ante sedem Dei et Agni*, quaeque homines, in primis divino cultui addictos docet, ex Athanasii sententia, *qua ratione Deum laudare oporteat quibusque verbis decenter confiteantur* (Epist. ad Marcellinum in interpret. Psalmor., n. 10). Pulchre ad rem Augustinus: *Ut bene ab homine laudetur Deus, laudavit se ipse Deus; et quia dignatus est laudare se, ideo invenit homo, quemadmodum laudet eum* (In Psalm 144, n. 1).

Accedit quod in Psalmis mirabilis quaedam vis inest ad excitanda in animis omnium studia virtutum. Etsi enim *omnis nostra Scriptura, cum vetus tum nova, divinitus inspirata utilisque ad doctrinam est, ut scriptum habetur; . . . at Psalmorum liber, quasi paradisi omnium reliquorum (librorum fructus) in se continens, cantus edit, et proprios insuper cum ipsis inter psallendum exhibit*. Haec iterum Athanasius (Epist. ad Marcell. cit. n. 2), qui recte ibidem addit: *Mihi quidem videtur, psallenti Psalmos esse instar speculi, ut et seipsum et proprii animi motus in ipsis contempletur, atque ita affectus eos recitet* (Op. cit., n. 12). Itaque Augustinus in Confessionibus: *Quantum, inquit, flevi in hymnis et canticis tuis suave sonantis Ecclesiae tuae vocibus commotus acriter! Voces illae influebant auribus meis et eliquabatur veritas in cor meum et exaestuabat nide affectus pietatis et currebant lacrimae et bene mihi erat cum eis* (Lib. IX., cap. 6). Etenim, quem non moveant frequentes illi Psalmorum loci, in quibus de immensa maiestate Dei, de omnipotentia, de inenarrabili iustitia aut bonitate aut clementia de ceterisque infinitis laudibus eius tam alter praedicatur? Cui non

similes sensus inspirent illae pro acceptis a Deo beneficiis gratiarum actiones, aut pro exspectatis humiles fidentesque preces, aut illi de peccatis clamores paenitentis animae? Quem non admiratione psaltes perfundat, cum divinae benignitatis munera in populum Israel atque in omne hominum genus profecta narrat, cumque caelestis sapientiae dogmata tradit? Quem denique non amore inflammet adumbrata studiose imago Christi Redemptoris, cuius quidem Augustinus (In Ps. 42, n. 1) *vocem in omnibus Psalms vel psallentem, vel gemetem, vel laetantem in spe, vel suspirantem in re* audiebat?

Iure igitur optimo provisum est antiquitus, et per decreta Romanorum Pontificum, et per canones Conciliorum, et per monasticas leges, ut homines ex utroque clero integrum Psalterium per singulas hebdomadas concinerent vel recitarent. Atque hanc quidem legem a patribus traditam decessores Nostri S. Pius V., Clemens VIII., Urbanus VIII. in recognoscendo Breviario Romano sancte servarunt. Unde etiam nunc Psalterium intra unius hebdomadae spatium recitandum foret integrum, nisi mutata rerum condicione talis recitatio frequenter impediretur.

Etenim procedente tempore continenter crevit inter fideles eorum hominum numerus, quos Ecclesia, mortali vita defunctos, caelicolis accensere et populo christiano patronos et vivendi duces consuevit proponere. In ipsorum vero honorem Officia de Sanctis sensim propagari coeperunt, unde fere factum est, ut de Dominicis diebus deque Feriis Officia silerent ideoque non pauci neglegerentur Psalmi, qui sunt tamen, non secus ac ceteri, ut Ambrosius ait (Enarrat. in Ps. 1, n. 9) *benedictio populi, Dei laus; plebis laudatio, plausus omnium, sermo universorum, vox Ecclesiae, fidei canora confessio, auctoritatis plena devotio, libertatis laetitia, clamor incunditatis, laetitiae resultatio*. De huiusmodi autem omissione non semel graves fuerunt prudentum piorumque virorum querimoniae, quod non modo hominibus sacri ordinis tot subtraherentur praesidia ad laudandum dominum et ad intimos animi sensus ei significandos aptissima; sed etiam quod optabilis illa in orando varietas desideraretur, ad digne, attente, devote precandum imbecillitati nostrae quam maxime opportuna. Nam, ut Basilius habet, *in aequalitate torpescit saepe, nescio quomodo, animus, atque praesens absens est: mutatis vero et variatis psalmodia et cantu per singulas horas, renovatur eius desiderium et attentio instauratur* (Regulae fusius tractatae, interrog. 37, n. 5).

Minime igitur mirum, quod complures e diversis orbis partibus sacrorum Antistites sua in hanc rem vota ad Apostolicam Sedem detulerunt, maximeque in Concilio Vaticano, cum hoc inter cetera postularunt, ut, quoad posset, revocaretur consuetudo vetus recitandi

per hebdomadam totum Psalterium, ita tamen ut clero, in sacri ministerii vinea ob imminutum operariorum numerum iam gravius laboranti, non maius imponeretur onus. Hisce vero postulationibus et votis, quae Nostra quoque ante susceptum Pontificatum fuerant, itemque precibus, quae deinceps ab aliis Venerabilibus Fratribus piisque viris admotae sunt. Nos equidem concedendum duximus, cauto tamen, ne recitatione integri Psalterii hebdomadae spatio conclusa, ex una parte quicquam de Sanctorum cultu decederet, neve ex altera molestius Divini Officii onus clericis, immo temperatius evaderet. Quapropter, implorato suppliciter *Patre luminum*, corrogatisque in id ipsum suffragiis sanctarum precum, Nos vestigiis insistentes decessorum Nostrorum, aliquot viros delegimus doctos et industrios, quibus commisimus, ut consiliis studiisque collatis certam aliquam reperirent rei efficiendae rationem, quae Nostris optatis responderet. Illi autem commissum sibi munus e sententia exsequentes novam Psalterii dispositionem elaborarunt; quam cum S. R. E. Cardinales sacris ritibus cognoscendis praepositi diligenter consideratam probassent, Nos, utpote cum mente Nostra admodum congruentem, ratam habuimus in rebus omnibus, id est, quod ad ordinem ac partitionem Psalmorum, ad Antiphonas, ad Versiculos, ad Hymnos attinet cum suis Rubricis et Regulis, eiusque editionem authenticam in Nostra typographia Vaticana adornari et indidem evulgari iussimus.

Quoniam vero Psalterii dispositio intimam quandam habet cum omni Divino Officio et Liturgia coniunctionem, nemo non videt, per ea, quae hic a Nobis decreta sunt, primum Nos fecisse gradum ad Romani Breviarii et Missalis emandationem: sed super tali causa proprium mox Consilium seu Commissionem, ut aiunt, eruditorum constituemus. Interim, opportunitatem hanc nacti, nonnulla iam in praesenti instauranda censuimus, prout in appositis Rubricis praescribitur: atque imprimis quidem ut in recitando Divino Officio Lectionibus statutis sacrae Scripturae cum Responsoriis de tempore occurrentibus debitus honor frequentiore usu restitueretur; dein vero ut in sacra Liturgia Missae antiquissimae de Dominicis infra annum et de Feriis, praesertim quadragesimalibus, locum suum recuperarent.

Itaque, harum auctoritate litterarum, ante omnia Psalterii ordinem, qualis in Breviario Romano hodie est, abolemus eiusque usum, inde a Kalendis Januariis anni millesimi nongentesimi decimi tertii, omnino interdicimus. Ex illo autem die in omnibus ecclesiis Cleri saecularis et regularis, in monasteriis, ordinibus, congregationibus, institutisque religiosorum ab omnibus et singulis, qui ex officio aut ex consuetudine Horas canonicas iuxta Breviarium Romanum, a S. Pio V. editum et a Clemente VIII., Urbano VIII., Leone XIII. recognitum, persolvunt, novum Psalterii ordinem, qualem Nos cum suis Regulis

et Rubricis approbavimus typisque Vaticanis vulgandum decrevimus, religiose observari iubemus. Simul vero poenas in iure statutas iis denuntiamus, qui suo officio persolvendi quotidie Horas canonicas defuerint; qui quidem sciant se tam gravi non satisfacturos officio, nisi Nostrum hunc Psalterii ordinem adhibeant.

Omnibus igitur Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus ceterisque ecclesiarum Praelatis, ne Cardinalibus quidem Archiepresbyteris patriarchalium Urbis basilicarum exceptis, mandamus, ut in sua quisque diocesi, ecclesia vel coenobio Psalterium cum Regulis et Rubricis, quemadmodum a Nobis dispositum est, constituto tempore inducendum curent: quod Psalterium quasque Regulas et Rubricas etiam a ceteris omnibus, quoscumque obligatio tenet recitandi vel concinendi Horas canonicas, inviolate adhiberi ac servari praecipimus. Interim autem cuilibet et capitulis ipsis, modo id maior capituli pars sibi placere ostenderit, novum Psalterii ordinem, statim post eius editionem, rite usurpare licebit.

Haec vero edicimus, declaramus, sancimus, decernentes has Nostras litteras validas et efficaces semper esse ac fore; non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis, generalibus et specialibus, ceterisque quibusvis in contrarium facientibus. Nulli ergo hominum liceat hanc paginam Nostrae abolitionis, revocationis, permissionis, iussionis, praecepti, statuti, indulti, mandati et voluntatis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare praesumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius, se noverit incursurum.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicae millesimo nongentesimo undecimo, Kalendis Novembribus, in festo Sanctorum omnium, Pontificatus Nostri anno nono.

FR. SEB. CARDINALIS MARTINELLI,

S. R. C. Praefectus.

A. CARDINALIS AGLIARDI,

S. R. E. Cancellarius.

Loco ✠ Plumbi.

Visa

M. RIGGI, C. A., *Not.*

Reg. in Conc. Ap. N. 571.

RUBRICAE

IN RECITATIONE DIVINI OFFICII

ET IN MISSARUM CELEBRATIONE

SERVANDAE

AD NORMAM CONSTITUTIONIS APOSTOLICAE

"DIVINO AFFLATU."

TITULUS I.

De ratione Divini Officii recitandi iuxta novum Psalterii ordinem.

1. In recitatione Divini Officii, iuxta Romanum Ritus, Psalmi quotidie sumendi sunt, ad singulas Horas canonicas, de occurrente hebdomadae die, prout distribuuntur in Psalterio noviter disposito; quod deinceps, loco veteris dispositionis, in novis Breviarii Romani editionibus vulgandum erit.

2. Excipiuntur tamen omnia Festa Domini eorumque integrae Octavae, Dominicae infra Octavas Nativitatis, Epiphaniae, Ascensionis et Corporis Domini, Vigilia Epiphaniae et FERIA VI. post Octavam Ascensionis, quando de eis persolvendum sit Officium; itemque Vigilia Nativitatis ad Laudes et ad reliquas Horas minores usque ad Nonam, et Vigilia Pentecostes; nec non omnia Festa Beatae Mariae Virginis, SS. Angelorum, S. Ioannis Baptistae, S. Ioseph et SS. Apostolorum et Duplicitas I. et II. classis, eorumque omnium integrae Octavae, si de eis fiat Officium, quod recitandum erit prout assignatur, vel in Breviario, vel in Proprio Dioecesis vel Instituti, hac lege tamen ut Psalmi ad Laudes, Horas et Completorium semper sumendi sint ex Dominica, ut in novo Psalterio; ad Matutinum vero et ad Vesperas dicantur ut in Communi, nisi speciales Psalmi sint assignati. Tribus autem ultimis diebus maioris hebdomadae, nil erit innovandum, sed Officium integre persolvendum erit, prout nunc habetur in Breviario, sumptis tamen ad Laudes Psalmis de FERIA currenti, ut in novo Psalterio, excepto Cantico Sabbati Sancti, quod etiamnum est "*Ego dixi: In dimidio.*" Ad Completorium sumantur Psalmi de Dominica, uti in novo pariter Psalterio.

3. In quolibet alio Festo Duplici, etiam maiore, vel Semiduplici, vel Simpliciter, et in Feriis Tempore Paschali semper dicantur Psalmi, cum Antiphonis in omnibus Horis, et Versibus ad Matutinum, ut in Psalterio de occurrenti hebdomadae die; reliqua omnia, et Antiphonae ad *Magnificat* et *Benedictus*, ut in Proprio aut Communi. Quod si aliquod ex Festis huiusmodi proprias vel peculiariter assignatas habeat Antiphonas in aliqua Hora maiori, eas in eadem

ipsa retineat cum suis Psalmis, prout habetur in Breviario: in ceteris Horis Psalmi et Antiphonae dicantur de Feria occurrente.

4. Lectiones ad Matutinum in I. Nocturno semper legendae erunt de Scriptura occurrente, licet aliquando in Breviario Lectiones de Communi assignentur, nisi sit Festum Domini aut Festum cuiusvis ritus B. Mariae Virginis, vel Angelorum, vel S. Ioannis Baptistae, vel S. Ioseph, vel Apostolorum, aut Duplex I. vel II. classis, aut agatur de Festo, quod vel Lectiones habeat proprias, non vero de Communi, vel occurrat in Feriis Lectiones de Scriptura non habentibus, ideoque Lectiones de Communi necessario recipiat. In Festis vero, in quibus hucusque erant Lectiones de Communi, Responsoria vero propria, retineantur eadem Lectiones cum propriis Responsoriis.

5. Porro sic erit persolvendum Officium in Festis Duplicibus et Semiduplicibus superius non exceptis:

Ad Matutinum Invitatorium, Hymnus, Lectiones II. et III. Nocturni ac Responsoria trium Nocturnorum propria, vel de Communi: Antiphonae vero, Psalmi et Versus trium Nocturnorum, nec non Lectiones I. Nocturni de Feria occurrente.

Ad Laudes et ad Vesperas Antiphonae cum Psalmis de Feria; Capitulum, Hymnus, Versus et Antiphona ad *Benedictus* vel ad *Magnificat* cum Oratione aut ex Proprio, aut de Communi.

Ad Horas minores et Completorium Antiphonae cum Psalmis semper dicuntur de occurrente Feria. Ad Primam pro Lectione brevi legitur Capitulum Nonae ex Proprio, vel de Communi. Ad Tertiam, Sextam et Nonam Capitulum, Responsorium breve et Oratio pariter sumuntur vel ex Proprio, vel de Communi.

6. In Officio S. Mariae in Sabbato et in Festis Simplicibus sic Officium persolvendum est: ad Matutinum Invitatorium et Hymnus dicuntur de eodem Officio vel de iisdem Festis; Psalmi cum suis Antiphonis et Versu de Feria occurrente; I. et II. Lectio de Feria, cum Responsoriis propriis, vel de Communi; III. vero Lectio de Officio vel Festo, duabus Lectionibus in unam iunctis, si quando duae pro Festo habeantur: ad reliquas autem Horas omnia dicuntur, prouti supra, n. 5, de Festis Duplicibus expositum est.

7. In Feriis et in Festis Simplicibus Psalmi ad Matutinum, qui in novo Psalterio in tres Nocturnos dispositi inveniuntur, dicantur sine interruptione cum suis novem Antiphonis usque ad tertium Versum inclusive, omissis Versibus primo et secundo.

TITULUS II.

De Festorum praestantia.

1. Ut recte dignoscatur quale ex pluribus Officiis sit praestantius

et proinde sive in occurrentia, sive in concurrentia, sive in ordine repositionis aut translationis praeferendum, sequentes praestantiae characteres considerandi sunt:

(a) *Ritus altior*, nisi occurrat Dominica, vel Feria, vel Octava privilegiata, vel etiam quaelibet dies Octava iuxta Rubricas.

(b) *Ratio Primarii* aut *Secundarii*.

(c) *Dignitas Personalis*, hoc ordine servato: Festa Domini, B. Mariae Virginis, Angelorum, S. Ioannis Baptistae, S. Ioseph, SS. Apostolorum et Evangelistarum.

(d) *Sollemnitatis externa*, scilicet si Festum sit feriatum, aut celebretur cum Octava.

2. In occurrentia, et in ordine repositionis aut translationis, alius quoque character considerandus est, nempe:

(e) *Proprietas Festorum*. Dicitur Festum alicuius loci proprium, si agatur de Titulo Ecclesiae, de loci Patrono etiam secundario, de Sancto (in Martyrologio vel in eius appendice approbata descripto), cuius habetur corpus vel aliqua insignis et authentica reliquia, vel de Sancto, qui cum Ecclesia, vel loco, vel personarum coetu specialem habeat rationem. Igitur Festum quodvis istiusmodi proprium, ceteris paribus, praefertur Festo Universalis Ecclesiae. Excipiuntur tamen Dominicae, Feriae, Octavae et Vigiliae privilegiatae, nec non Festa primaria Duplicia I. classis Universalis Ecclesiae, quae uniuscuiusque loci propria considerantur et sunt. Festum autem Universalis Ecclesiae, cuiusvis ritus, quia est praeceptivum, ceteris paribus, praeferrí debet Festis aliquibus locis ex mero Indulto S. Sedis concessis, quae tamen propria, sensu quo supra, dici nequeunt.

TITULUS III.

De Festorum occurrentia accidentali eorumque translatione.

1. De Dominicis maioribus I. classis, quodvis Festum in eis occurrat, semper faciendum est Officium: Dominicae vero II. classis cedunt tantummodo Festis Duplicibus I. classis, quo in casu de Dominica fit commemoratio in utrisque Vesperis, Laudibus et Missa cum IX. Lectione ad Matutinum.

2. De Dominicis minoribus, seu per annum, semper fieri debet Officium, nisi occurrat Festum quodcumque Domini, aut aliquod Duplex I. vel II. classis, aut dies Octava Festorum Domini, quo in casu in Officio Festi vel diei Octavae fit commemoratio Dominicae in utrisque Vesperis et Laudibus et Missa cum IX. Lectione ad Matutinum. Si Dominica infra Octavam Nativitatis occurrat in Festo S. Thomae Ep. M. aut in Festo S. Silvestri P. C., fit Officium de ipsa Dominica cum commemoratione Festi occurrentis; quo in casu die 30 Decembris, in Officio diei infra Octavam, Lectiones I.

et II. Nocturni sumuntur e Festo Nativitatis, cum Responsoriis Dominicæ. Quoad Dominicam vero, quæ occurrit a Festo Circumcisionis usque ad Epiphaniam, nihil innovetur.

3. Duplicia I. et II. classis, quæ seu ab aliqua Dominica maiori, seu a nobiliori Officio impediuntur, transferenda sunt in proximiorum diem, quæ libera sit ab alio Festo Duplici I. vel II. classis, vel ab Officiis huiusmodi Festa excludentibus; salvo tamen privilegio a Rubricis concessio Festivitatis Purificationis et Annuntiationis B. M. V., nec non Commemorationis sollemnis S. Ioseph.

4. Festa Duplicia maiora cuiusvis dignitatis et Duplicia minora Doctorum Ecclesiæ non amplius transferri possunt, sed quando impediuntur, de eis fiat commemoratio, uti de aliis Duplicibus minoribus impeditis Rubricæ disponunt (salvo quod numero sequenti statuitur de omittenda in Dominicis IX. Lectione historica), nisi forte occurrant in Duplicibus I. classis, in quibus nullius Officii agenda est commemoratio, nisi de occurrenti Dominica, vel de Feria, aut Octava privilegiata.

5. Porro si in Dominica maiori occurrat Officium Duplex maius aut minus, vel Semiduplex, vel Simplex, fiat de Dominica cum commemoratione Officii occurrentis in utrisque Vesperis (de Simplicibus tamen in primis Vesperis tantum) Laudibus et Missa, sine IX. Lectione historica. Idem fiat in Dominicis minoribus, nisi in eis occurrat Festum quodcumque Domini, aut quodvis Duplex I. vel II. classis, aut dies Octava Festorum Domini, quo in casu, ut supra n. 2 dictum est, fiat de Festo, vel de Octava cum commemoratione et IX. Lectione Dominicæ.

6. Dies, in qua celebratur Commemoratio omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, excludit translationem cuiusvis Festi.

TITULUS IV.

De Festorum occurrentia perpetua eorumque repositione.

1. Festa omnia ritus Duplicis sive maioris sive minoris, aut Semiduplicis, si perpetuo impediuntur, reponuntur in primam diem liberam, iuxta Rubricas.

2. Festa Duplicia I. et II. classis perpetuo impedita reponuntur, tamquam in sedem propriam, in primam diem liberam ab alio Festo Duplici I. aut II. classis, vel ab aliqua die Octava, vel ab Officiis huiusmodi Festa excludentibus, salvo privilegio Festivati Purificationis B. M. V. concessio.

3. Dominicæ maiores excludunt assignationem perpetuam cuiusvis Festi Duplicis etiam I. classis: Dominicæ vero minores assignationem excludunt cuiuscumque Duplicis maioris aut minoris, nisi sit

Festum Domini. Festum SS. Nominis Mariae perpetuo assignatur diei duodecimae mensis Septembris.

4. Dies II. Novembris excludit tum Festa occurrentia quae non sint Duplicia I. classis, tum Festa perpetuo reponenda cuiusvis ritus.

TITULUS V.

De concurrentia Festorum.

1. Dominicae maiores Vesperas habent integras in concurrentia cum quovis Festo, nisi sit ritus Duplicis I. aut II. classis: ideoque in primis Vesperis sumuntur Antiphonae cum Psalmis de Sabbato; in Adventu tamen dicuntur Antiphonae de Laudibus Dominicae cum iisdem Psalmis de Sabbato.

2. Dominicae minores cedunt Vesperas, tum Duplicibus I. aut II. classis, tum omnibus Festis Domini, tum diebus Octavis Festorum Domini: integras autem habent Vesperas in concursu cum aliis Festis, sumptis in I. Vesperis Antiphonis et Psalmis de Sabbato.

3. Leges, quibus ordinantur Vesperae infra Octavam Nativitatis Domini, immutatae manent.

TITULUS VI.

De Commemorationibus.

1. In Duplicibus I. classis non fiat commemoratio de praecedenti, nisi fuerit aut Dominica quaevis, etiam per annum, aut Duplex I vel II. classis, aut dies Octava alicuius Festi Domini primarii, aut dies infra Octavam privilegiatam, aut Feria maior. In occurrentia fiat tantum commemoratio de Dominica quacumque, de Octava privilegiata et de Feria maiori. De sequenti vero Officio (etiam ad modum Simplicis redacto) fiat semper commemoratio, minime autem de die infra Octavam non privilegiatam aut de Simplici.

2. In Duplicibus II. classis de praecedenti Officio semper fieri debet commemoratio, nisi fuerit de aliquo Festo Semiduplici, vel de die infra Octavam non privilegiatam. In occurrentia fit commemoratio de quavis Dominica, de quolibet Duplici vel Semiduplici ad modum Simplicis redato, de Octava privilegiata, de Feria maiori et de Vigilia: de Simplici vero fit tantum in Laudibus et in Missis privatis. De sequenti autem Officio quolibet, etiam Simplici vel ad modum Simplicis redacto, fit semper commemoratio, ac etiam de die infra Octavam, si in crastino Officium de ea agendum sit; et tunc cum Antiphona et Versiculo e I. Vesperis Festi.

3. Licet Festa Domini eorumque Octavae privilegio gaudeant ut in occurrentia praeveleant Dominicis minoribus, nihilominus, quando plures fieri debeant commemorationes (cauto quod in Vesperis semper fiat prima commemoratio de Officio concurrenti, cuiusvis ritus et dignitatis), tam in Vesperis, quam in Laudibus et Missa hic

ordo servetur: 1.^o de Dominica qualibet; 2.^o de die infra Octavam Epiphaniae aut Corporis Christi; 3.^o de die Octava; 4.^o de Duplici maiore; 5.^o de Duplici minore; 6.^o de Semiduplici; 7.^o de die infra Octavam communem; 8.^o de Feria VI. post Octavam Ascensionis; 9.^o de Feria maiori; 10.^o de Vigilia; 11.^o de Simplici.

TITULUS VII.

De conclusionem propria Hymnorum et versu proprio ad Primam, de Suffragiis Sanctorum, de Precibus, de Symbolo Athanasiano et de tertia oratione in Missa.

1. Quando eadem die occurrunt plura Officia, quae propriam habeant conclusionem Hymnorum vel proprium Versum ad Primam, conclusio et Versus dicantur, quae propria sunt Officii, quod ea die recitatur.

2. Deinceps, quando facienda erunt Suffragia Sanctorum, unum tantum fiet Suffragium, iuxta formulam propositam in Ordinario novi Psalterii.

3. Symbolum Athanasianum additur ad Primam in Festo SS. Trinitatis et in Dominicis tantummodo post Epiphaniam et post Pentecosten, quando de eis persolvendum est Officium salva exceptione, de qua n. sequenti.

4. Quando in Dominica fit commemoratio de aliquo Officio Duplici, vel de die Octava, vel de die infra Octavam, omittuntur Suffragium, Preces, Symbolum *Quicumque* et tertia Oratio in Missa.

TITULUS VIII.

De Officiis votivis deque aliis Officiis additiis.

1. Cum per hanc novam Psalterii dispositionem causae cessaverint Indulti Generalis d. d. 5 Iulii 1883 pro Officiis votivis, haec ipsa Officia, et alia similia ex particularibus indultis concessa, tolluntur omnino et sublata declarantur.

2. Cessat pariter obligatio recitandi in Choro, diebus a Rubricis hucusque vigentibus praescriptis, Officium parvum B. Mariae Virginis, Officium Defunctorum, nec non Psalmos Graduales ac Paenitentiales. Capitula vero, quae ad ista Officia addititia ex peculiari constitutione aut legato tenentur, a Sancta Sede eorum commutationem impetrabunt.

3. In Festo S. Marci et in Triduo Rogationum integrum manet onus recitandi Litanias Sanctorum, etiam extra Chorum.

TITULUS IX.

De Festis Dedicationis ac Tituli Ecclesiae et de Patronis.

1. Festum Dedicationis cuiuslibet Ecclesiae est semper primum, et Festum Domini.

2. Anniversarium Dedicationis Ecclesiae Cathedralis et Festum Titulare eiusdem celebranda sunt sub ritu Duplici I. classis cum Octava per totam Dioecesim ab universo Clero saeculari et etiam regulari Kalendarium Dioecesanum adhibente: a Regularibus vero utriusque sexus in eadem Dioecesi commorantibus ac proprium Kalendarium habentibus, pariter sub ritu duplici I. classis, absque tamen Octava.

3. Quum Sacrosancta Lateranensis Archibasilica omnium Ecclesiarum Urbis et Orbis sit mater et caput, tum ipsius Dedicationis Anniversarium, tum Festum Transfigurationis Domini, quod, praeter magnam Resurrectionis Dominicae sollemnitatem, tamquam Titulare ab ipsa recoli solet, ab universo Clero tam saeculari quam regulari, etiam ab illis qui peculiarem ritum sequuntur, sub ritu Duplici II. classis deinceps celebrabitur.

4. Festum Patroni principalis Oppidi, vel Civitatis, vel Dioecesis, vel Provinciae, vel Nationis, Clerus saecularis, et regularis ibi degens et Kalendarium Dioecesanum sequens sub ritu Duplici I classis cum Octava celebrabit: Regulares vero ibidem commorantes et Kalendarium proprium habentes, idem Festum, quamvis feriatum nunquam fuerit, eodem ritu celebrabunt, absque tamen Octava.

TITULUS X.

De Missis in Dominicis et Feriis deque Missis pro Defunctis.

1. In Dominicis, etiam minoribus, quodcumque Festum occurrat, dummodo non sit Festum Domini, vel eius dies Octava, aut Duplex I. vel II. classis, Missa semper dicenda erit de Dominica cum commemoratione festi. Quod si Festum commemorandum sit Duplex, tunc omittenda est III. Oratio.

2. In Feriis Quadragesimae, Quatuor Temporum, II. Rogationum, et in Vigiliis, si occurrat fieri Officium alicuius Festi Duplicis (non tamen I. vel II. classis) aut Semiduplicis, Missae privatae dici poterunt ad libitum, vel de Festo cum commemoratione ultimoque Evangelio Feriae aut Vigiliae, vel de Feria aut Vigilia cum commemoratione Festi: prohibentur tamen Missae votivae privatae, aut privatae pro Defunctis: quae item prohibentur in Feria, in qua anticipanda vel reponenda est Missa Dominicae. In Quadragesima vero Missae privatae Defunctorum celebrari tantum poterunt prima die cuiuscumque hebdomadae libera in Kalendario Ecclesiae, in qua Missa celebratur.

3. Si alicubi aliquod Festum impeditum a Dominica minore, celebratur ex voto, vel cum populi concursu (cuius rei iudex erit Ordinarius), Missae de eodem festo impedito celebrari poterunt, dummodo una Missa de Dominica ne omittatur. Quoties extra

ordinem Officii cantetur vel legatur aliqua Missa, si facienda sit commemoratio aut Dominicae, aut Feriae, aut Vigiliae, semper de hisce etiam Evangelium in fine legatur.

4. Ad Missam Dominicae etiam minoris, cum commemoratione Festi Duplicis tum maioris tum minoris ac diei infra Octavam quomodolibet celebrandam, retinetur color proprius Dominicae, cum Praefatione SSmae Trinitatis, nisi adsit propria Temporis, vel Octavae alicuius Festi Domini.

5. Leges pro Missis Defunctorum in cantu, immutatae manent. Missae vero lectae permittuntur in Duplicibus tantummodo in die obitus, aut pro die obitus, dummodo ne sit Festum de praecepto, aut Duplex I. vel II. classis, vel Feria excludens Duplicia I. classis. Quoad vero Missas lectas Defunctorum dicendas diebus ritus Semiduplicis aut Simplicis, in posterum numquam celebrari poterunt in Feriis n. 2 enumeratis, salva tamen exceptione ibidem admissa. Licebit tamen in huiusmodi Missis de FERIA orationem addi pro Defunctis, pro quibus Sacrificium applicatur, paenultimo loco, prout permittit Rubrica Missalis. Cum autem ut applicari possint Indulgentiae Altaris privilegiati, Missae Defunctorum debuerint hucusque in nigris celebrari, Summus Pontifex easdem indulgentias in posterum benigne concedit, licet Missa dicatur de FERIA, cum oratione pro Defunctis. In reliquis autem Feriis per annum n. 2 non exceptis, nec non in Semiduplicibus, infra Octavas non privilegiatas et in Simplicibus, Missae Defunctorum sicut et aliae Missae votivae dici poterunt iuxta Rubricas.

TITULUS XI.

De Collectis in Missis.

Quod ad Collectas ab Ordinariis locorum imperatas attinet, deinceps prohibentur (nisi sint pro re gravi praescriptae) non tantum in Vigiliis Nativitatis et Pentecostes et in Duplicibus I. classis, sed etiam in Duplicibus II. classis, in Dominicis Maioribus, infra Octavas privilegiatas, et quandocumque in Missa dicendae sint plus quam tres Orationes a Rubrica eo die praescriptae.

TITULUS XII.

De Missis Conventualibus.

In Ecclesiis, in quibus adest obligatio Chori, una tantum Missa cum assistentia Choralium semper celebretur; et quidem de Officio diei, nisi aliter Rubricae disponant; aliae Missae, quae hucusque cum praedicta assistentia celebrabantur, in posterum extra Chorum legantur, post propriam Horam Canonicam; excipiuntur tamen ab

hac regula Missae in Litaniiis maioribus et minoribus, et Missae in Festo Nativitatis Domini. Excipiuntur pariter Missae in anniversariis Creationis et Coronationis Summi Pontificis, Electionis et Consecrationis seu Translationis Episcopi, nec non in anniversario ultimi Episcopi defuncti, et omnium Episcoporum aut Canonicorum; omnesque Missae ex fundatione.

TITULUS XIII.

De Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum.

1. In Commemoratione omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, omissis Officio et Missa diei currentis, fit tantum Officium cum Missa pro Defunctis, prout in Appendice novi Psalterii praescribitur.

2. Si die 2 Novembris occurrat Dominica vel aliquod Duplex I. classis, Commemoratio Defunctorum celebrabitur die proxime sequenti, similiter non impedita; in qua, si forte occurrat Duplex II. classis, hoc transfertur iuxta regulam traditam Tit. III., n. 3.

PRÆSCRIPTIONES TEMPORARIAE.

I.^o Kalendaria uniuscuiusque Dioeceseos, aut Ordinis seu Congregationis Breviario Romano utentium, pro anno 1913, ad Regulas supra traditas omnino redigenda sunt.

II.^o Diebus Dominicis, quibus in Kalendaris proximi anni 1912 inscribuntur, sub ritu Duplici maiori vel minori, Festa Sanctorum, vel Angelorum, vel etiam B. Mariae Virginis, vel dies Octava, quae non sit Festorum Domini, tum Officium in privata recitatione, tum Missae lectae erunt ad libitum, vel prout notatur in Kalendario anni 1912, vel de Dominica cum commemoratione duplicis maioris aut minoris. In Feriis quoque, de quibus Tit. X., n. 2, Missae privatae celebrari poterunt, ut ibi adnotatur.

III.^o Quod Tit. XIII. harum Rubricarum dispositum est quoad Commemorationem Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum, inde ab anno 1912, in usum omnino deducendum est.

IV.^o Usque dum nova correctio Breviarii et Missalis Romani, a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro decreta, vulgetur:

(a) Kalendaria perpetua Sacrae Rituum Congregationi reformanda et approbanda deferri non debent;

(b) De Festorum augendo ritu, vel de Festis novis invehendis nulla fiat postulatio;

(c) Festa particularia, sive B. Mariae Virginis, sive Sanctorum aut Beatorum, ritus Duplicis maioris aut minoris, Dominicis diebus assignata, locorum Ordinarii seu Superiores Regularium, aut in

utrisque Vesperis, Laudibus et Missa commemoranda praescribant; aut in aliam diem, validis S. R. C. oblatis argumentis, transferenda curent; aut potius omittant.

(d) Nulla interim facta correctione Rubricarum, Regulae superius traditae in novis Breviariis et Missalibus post Rubricas Generales inserantur, omissis S. R. C. Decretis, quae hucusque in principio Breviarii inserta inveniuntur.

(e) In futuris Breviarii editionibus mutantur, ob novam Psalterii reformationem, sequentes Antiphonae in Laudibus:

In Dominica Sexagesimae:

Ant. 5. In excelsis * laudate Deum.

In Dominica III. Quadragesimae:

Ant. 3. Adhaesit anima mea * post te, Deus meus.

In Dominica IV. Quadragesimae:

Ant. 3. Me suscepit * dextera tua, Domine.

In Feria IV. Maioris Hebdomadae:

Ant. 3. Tu autem, Domine, * scis omne consilium eorum adversum me in mortem.

Ant. 5. Fac, Domine, * iudicium iniuriam patientibus: et vias peccatorum disperde.

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

ON THE NEW ARRANGEMENT OF THE PSALTERY

IN THE ROMAN BREVIARY.

PIUS BISHOP

SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD

FOR PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

DIVINO AFFLATU) It is beyond question that the Psalms composed under Divine inspiration, which are collected in the Sacred Books, have from the beginning of the Church not only contributed wonderfully to foster the piety of the faithful offering the sacrifice of praise always to God, that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing to His name (Heb. xiii., 15), but have also had a conspicuous part, from custom introduced under the Old Law, in the sacred liturgy itself and in the divine office. Hence, as Basil says, that natural voice of the Church (Homil. in Ps. i., n. 2,) and the psalmody called by our predecessor, Urban VIII. (Bulla "Divinam psalmodian"), the daughter of her hymnody which is constantly sung before the throne of God and the Lamb, and which, according to Athanasius, teaches the men whose chief care is the divine worship the manner in which God is to be praised and the words in which they art fitly to confess Him (Epist. ad Marcellinum in interpret. Psalmor., n. 10). Augustine beautifully says on the subject: "That God may be praised well by man, God Himself has praised Himself; and since He has been pleased to praise Himself man has found the way to praise Him (In Psalm cxliv., n. 1).

Besides, there is in the Psalms a certain wonderful power for stimulating zeal in men's minds for all the virtues. For although all our Scripture, both the Old and New, is divinely inspired and useful for doctrine, as is written, the Book of Psalms, like a paradise containing in itself (the fruits) of all the others, gives forth songs, and with them also shows its own songs in psalmody (cantus edit, et proprios insuper cum ipsis inter psallendum exhibet). Such are the words of Athanasius (Epist. ad Marcell. cit., n. 2), who rightly adds in the same place: "To me it seems that the Psalms for him who sings them are as a mirror in which he may contemplate himself and the movements of his soul and, under this influence, recite

them" (Op. cit., n. 12). Hence Augustine says in his Confessions: "How I wept in hymns and canticles, deeply moved by the voices of your sweetly sounding Church! These voices poured into my ears and truth became clear in my heart and then feelings of piety grew warm within me and my tears flowed and it was well with me for them" (Lib. IX., cap. 6). For who can fail to be stirred by those numerous passages of the Psalms which proclaim so loudly the immense majesty of God, His omnipotence, His ineffable justice or goodness or clemency, and His other infinite praises? Who can fail to be inspired with similar feelings by those thanksgivings for benefits received from God, or by those and trustful prayers for benefits desired, or those cries of the penitent soul for its sins? Who is not stirred to admiration by the Psalmist as he recounts the acts of divine goodness towards the people of Israel and the whole race of man and when he hands down the dogmas of heavenly wisdom? Who is not kindled with love by the picture of Christ the Redeemer lovingly shadowed forth whose voice Augustine heard in all the Psalms, praising or mourning, rejoicing in hope or yearning for accomplishment? (In Ps. xlii., n. 1.)

With good reason was provision made long ago, by decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, by canons of the Councils, and by monastic laws, that members of both branches of the clergy should chant or recite the entire Psalter every week. And this same law, handed down from antiquity, our predecessors St. Pius V., Clement VIII. and Urban VIII. religiously observed in revising the Roman Breviary. Even at present the Psalter should be recited in its entirety within the week, were it not that owing to the changed condition of things such recitation is frequently hindered.

For in the course of time there has been a constant increase among the faithful in the number of those whom the Church, after their mortal life, has been accustomed to count among the denizens of heaven and to set before the Christian people as patrons and models. In their honor the offices of the saints began to be gradually extended until it has come about that the offices of the Sundays and ferias are hardly ever heard, and thus neglect has fallen on not a few Psalms, albeit these are, no less than the others, as Ambrose says (Enerrat, in Ps. i., n. 9) "the benediction of the people, the praise of God, the praising of the multitude, the rejoicing of all, the speech of all, the voice of the Church, the resounding confession of faith, the full devotion of authority, the joy of liberty, the cry of gladness, the echo of joy." More than once serious complaints have been made by prudent and pious men about this omission; on the ground that owing to it those in sacred orders have been deprived of so many admirable aids for praising the Lord and ex-

pressing the inmost feelings of the soul, and that it has left them without that desirable variety in praying so highly necessary for our weakness in supplicating worthily, attentively and devoutly. For, as Basil has it, "the soul, in some strange way, frequently grows torpid in sameness, and what should be present to it becomes absent; whereas by changing and varying the psalmody and the chant for the different hours, its desire is renewed and its attention restored. (*Regulæ fusius tractatæ*, interrog. 37, n. 5.)

No wonder, then, that a great many Bishops in various parts of the world have sent expressions of their opinions on this matter to the Apostolic See, and especially in the Vatican Council when they asked, among other things, that the ancient custom of reciting the whole Psalter within the week might be restored as far as possible, but in such a way that the burden should not be made any heavier for the clergy, whose labors in the vineyard of the sacred ministry are now increased owing to the diminution in the number of the laborers. These petitions and wishes, which were our own, too, before we assumed the Pontificate, and also the appeals which have since come from others of our venerable brothers and from pious men, we have decided should be granted—but with care, so that from the reciting of the entire Psalter within the week no diminution in the cultus of the saints may follow, on the one hand, and on the other, that the burden of the divine office may become not more oppressive, but actually lighter. Wherefore, after having suppliantly implored the Father of Lights and asked for the assistance of holy prayers on the matter, following in the footsteps of our predecessor, chose a number of learned and active men with the task of studying and consulting together in order to find some way, which might meet our wishes, for putting the idea into execution. In fulfillment of the charge entrusted to them they elaborated a new arrangement of the Psalter, and this having been approved by the Cardinals of H. R. C. belonging to the Congregation of Sacred Rites, we have ratified it as being in entire harmony with our own mind, in all things, that is as regards the order and partition of the Psalms, the antiphons, versicles, hymns with their rubrics and rules, and we have ordered an authentic edition of it to be set up in our Vatican printing press and then published.

As the arrangement of the Psalter has a certain intimate connection with all the divine office and the Liturgy, it will be clear to everybody that by what we have here decreed we have taken the first step to the emendation of the Roman Breviary and the Missal, but for this we shall appoint shortly a special Council or Commission. Meanwhile, now that the occasion presents itself, we have decided

to make some changes at present, as is prescribed in the accompanying rubrics; and first among them, that in the recitation of the divine office due honor, by their more frequent use, be restored to the appointed lessons of Sacred Scripture with the responsories of the season, and, second, that in the Sacred Liturgy those most ancient Masses of the Sundays during the year and of the ferias, especially those of Lent, recover their place.

Therefore, by the authority of these letters, we first of all abolish the order of the Psalter as it is at present in the Roman Breviary, and we absolutely forbid the use of it after the 1st of January of the year 1913. From that day in all the churches of the secular and regular clergy, in the monasteries, orders, congregations and institutes of religious, by all and several who by office or custom recite the canonical hours according to the Roman Breviary issued by St. Pius V. and revised by Clement VIII., Urban VIII. and Leo XIII., we order the religious observance of the new arrangement of the Psalter in the form in which we have approved it and decreed its publication by the Vatican Printing Press. At the same time we proclaim the penalties prescribed in law against all who fail in their office of reciting the canonical hours every day; all such are to know that they shall not be satisfying this grave duty unless they use this our disposition of the Psalter.

We command, therefore, all the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots and other prelates of churches, not excepting even the Cardinal Archpriests of the patriarchal basilicas of the city, to take care to introduce at the appointed time into their respective dioceses, churches or monasteries, the Psalter with the rules and rubrics as arranged by us, and the Psalter and these rules and rubrics we order to be also inviolately used and observed by all others who are under the obligation of reciting or chanting the canonical hours. In the meanwhile it shall be lawful for everybody and for the chapters themselves, provided the majority of a chapter be in favor, to use duly the new order of the Psalter immediately after its publication.

This we publish, declare, sanction, decreeing that these our letters always are and shall be valid and effective, notwithstanding Apostolic Constitutions and ordinances, general and special, and everything else whatsoever to the contrary. Wherefore let nobody infringe or temerarily oppose this page of our abolition, revocation, permission, ordinance, precept, statute, indult, mandate and will. But if anybody shall presume to attempt this let him know that he will incur the indignation of Almighty God and of His Apostles the Blessed Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's in the year of the incarnation of

our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eleven, on November the first, the feast of All Saints, in the ninth year of our Pontificate.

A. CARD. AGLIARDI, Chancellor of H. R. C.—
FR. SEB. CARD. MARTINELLI, Prefect of
the S. C. R.

Visa

M. RIGGI, C. A., *Not.*

RUBRICS.

FOR THE RECITATION OF THE DIVINE OFFICE

AND THE CELEBRATION OF MASS

ACCORDING TO CONSTITUTION DIVINO AFFLATU.

TITULUS I.

On the method of reciting the divine office according to the new order of the Psaltery.

1. In the recitation of the divine office, according to the Roman Rite, the Psalms for each of the canonical hours are to be taken daily from the day of the week as they are distributed in the newly arranged Psaltery which is to be published, to take the place of the old arrangements, in the new editions of the Roman Breviary.

2. But exception is to be made for all the feasts of our Lord and their entire octaves, the Sundays within the octaves of the Nativity, Epiphany, the Ascension and Corpus Domini, the vigil of the Epiphany and the Friday after the octave of the Ascension, when the office of these days is to be said; so also for the vigil of the Nativity at Lauds and at the other little hours up to none, and the vigil of Pentecost; also for all the feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the Holy Angels, of St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, the Saints, Apostles and doubles of the first and second class, and for the entire octaves of all of them, if their office is said, which is to be said in the manner assigned, either in the Breviary or in the Proper of the diocese or institute, with this rule, however, that the Psalms and lauds, the hours and complin are to be taken from the Sunday, as in the new Psaltery; but at Matins and Vespers they are to be said as given in the Common unless where special Psalms are assigned. For the last three days of the Holy Week no change is to be made, but the office is to be said integrally as it now exists in the Breviary, the Psalms at lauds, however, being taken from the current Feria as in the new Psaltery, with the exception of the canticle of Holy Saturday, which remains still: *Ego dixi: In dimidio.*

At complin the Psalms are taken from the Sunday as in the new Psalter.

3. In every other double or major double feast, or in a semi-double or simple, and in the ferias during Eastertide the Psalms with their antiphons at all the hours and the verses at Matins are to be said as they are given in the Psalter for the occurring day of the week; all the rest, and the antiphons at the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*, as in the Proper or Common. But if any such feasts have proper or specially assigned antiphons in any of the greater hours it shall retain them in the same with its Psalms as given in the Breviary: in the other hours the Psalms and antiphons are to be said from the occurring feria.

4. The lessons at Matins in the first Nocturn are always to be read from the occurring Scripture, even though sometimes in the Breviary lessons from the Common be assigned—except on feasts of our Lord or feasts, of any class, of the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, the Apostles or a double of the first or second class, or in the case of a feast which has its lessons proper and not from the Common or which occurs in ferias which have no lessons from the Scripture, and therefore necessarily take their lessons from the Common. In feasts in which hitherto there were lessons from the Common but proper responsories, the same lessons with the proper responsories are to be retained.

5. In double and semi-double feasts not excepted above the office is to be said as follows:

At Matins, invitatorium, hymn, lessons of the second and third nocturn and responsories of the three nocturns proper or from the Common; the antiphons, psalms and verses of the three nocturns and the lessons of the first nocturn from the occurring feria.

At Lauds and Vespers the antiphons with psalms from the feria; the chapter, hymn, verses and antiphons at the *Benedictus* or *Magnificat*, with the prayer either from the Proper or from the Common.

At Little Hours and Complin the antiphons with the Psalms are always said from the occurring feria. At prime for the short lesson is read the chapter of None from the Proper or Common. At Tierce, Sext and None, the Chapter, Short Responsory and Prayer are likewise taken from the Proper or the Common.

6. In the Saturday Office of Our Lady and in simple feasts the office is to be said thus: At Matins the Invitatorium and Hymn are said from the same office or the same feasts; the Psalms with their antiphons and verse from the occurring feria; the first and second lessons from the feria, with responsories proper or from the Common; the third lesson from the office or feast, the two lessons being joined whenever there are two lessons for the feast:

at the other hours all are said as set forth above in No. 5 for double feasts.

7. In ferias and in simple feasts the Psalms at Matins, which are found in the new Psalter distributed into three nocturns, are to be said without interruption with their nine antiphons to the third verse inclusively, omitting the first and second verses.

TITULUS II.

On the order of importance of feasts.

1. To judge rightly which of several offices is higher, and, consequently, either in occurrence or concurrence or in order of deferment or translation is to be chosen, the following characteristics of dignity are to be considered:

(a) *Higher Rite*, unless when there occurs a privileged Sunday, or octave day, or even any octave day according to the rubrics;

(b) *The Quality of Primary or Secondary*:

(c) *Personal Dignity*, according to the following order: Feasts of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Angels, St. John Baptist, St. Joseph, Saints, Apostles and Evangelists;

(d) *External Solemnity*, that is, if the feast is *feriatum* or if it is celebrated with an octave.

2. In cases of *occurrence*, and in order of deferment or translation, another characteristic also is to be considered, viz.:

(e) The quality of *Proper* in feasts. A feast is said to be *proper* of a place in the case of the title of a church, the patron, even secondary, of the place, a saint (described in the Martyrology or in its approved appendix) whose body or any notable and authentic relic of whom is possessed, or a saint who has some special connection with the church, or the place, or the community. Therefore, any proper feast of this kind, *ceteris paribus*, takes precedence of a feast of the Universal Church; to be excepted, however, are the privileged Sundays, ferias, octave days and vigils, as well as primary double feasts of the first class of the Universal Church, which are considered and are proper of all places. A feast of Universal Church, of any rite whatsoever, inasmuch as it is preceptive, is, *ceteris paribus*, to take precedence of feasts granted to special places by mere indult of the Holy See, which cannot be said to be *proper* in the sense above described.

TITULUS III.

On the accidental occurrence and translation of feasts.

1. On major Sundays of the first class, whatever feast may occur on them, their office is always to be said; Sundays of the second class give way only to double feasts of the first class, in which case

commemoration of the Sunday is made in both Vespers, Lauds and in the Mass, together with the ninth lesson at Matins.

2. On minor Sundays, or Sundays through the year, the office of the day is always to be said, unless there occurs any feast of our Lord, or a double of the first or second class, or an octave day of the feast of our Lord, in which case in the office of the feast or octave day commemoration is made of the Sunday in both Vespers, Lauds and Mass, with the ninth lesson at Matins. If the Sunday within the octave of the Nativity occurs on the feast of St. Thomas, B. and M., or on the feast of St. Sylvester, B. and C., the office of the Sunday is said with the commemoration of the occurring feast; in which case on December 30, in the office of the day within the octave, the lessons of the first and second nocturns are taken from the feast of the Nativity, with the responsories of the Sunday. With regard to the Sunday which falls between the feast of the Circumcision and the Epiphany no change is to be made.

3. Doubles of the first and second class which are hindered either by some major Sunday or by some higher office are to be transferred to the nearest following day which is free from another double feast of the first or second class, or from offices excluding such feast, saving, however, the privilege conceded by the Rubrics to the feasts of the Purification and Annunciation of the B. V. M. and of the solemn commemoration of St. Joseph.

4. Double major feasts of whatever dignity and double minor feasts of the doctors of the Church can no longer be transferred, but when they are hindered, commemoration is made of them, as the Rubrics prescribe for other hindered double minor feasts (saving what is laid down in the following paragraph concerning the omission on Sundays of the ninth historical lesson) unless they happen to occur on doubles of the first class, in which commemoration is to be made of no office, except of the occurring Sunday, or feria, or privileged octave.

5. If in a major Sunday there occurs a double major or minor office, or a semi-double or simple, the office of the Sunday is to be said with commemoration of the occurring office in both Vespers (but only in first Vespers for a simple feast), lauds and Mass, without the ninth historical lesson. So also the Sunday office is to be said in minor Sundays, unless there occurs on them any feast of our Lord, or any double of the first and second class, or the octave day of a feast of our Lord, in which case, as has been said above in No. 1, the office is to be of the feast or of the octave day with the commemoration and ninth lesson of the Sunday.

6. The day on which is celebrated the commemoration of all the faithful departed excludes the translation of any feast whatsoever.

TITULUS IV.

On the perpetual occurrence of feasts and their translation.

1. All double feasts, major or minor, or semi-doubles, which are perpetually hindered are transferred to the first free day, according to the Rubrics.

2. Double feasts of the first and second class perpetually hindered are transferred, as to their proper place, to the first day free from another double feast of the first or second class or from any octave day, or from offices excluding feasts of this kind, saving the privilege conceded to the feast of the Purification of the B. V. M.

3. Major Sundays excluded the perpetual assignation of any double feast even of the first class: Minor Sundays exclude the assignation of any major or minor double, except it be a feast of our Lord. The feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary is perpetually assigned to September 12.

4. November 2 excludes both occurring feasts which are not doubles of the first class and perpetually transferred feasts of whatever rank.

TITULUS V.

On the concurrence of feasts.

1. Major Sundays have integral Vespers in concurrence with any feast whatsoever unless it be a double of the first or second class; therefore, in the first Vespers the antiphons with the Psalms are taken from the Saturday; but in Advent the antiphons are said from the Sunday Lauds, with the Saturday Psalms.

2. Minor Sundays cede Vespers to doubles of the first and second class to all feasts of our Lord and to the octave days of the feasts of our Lord; they have, however, integral Vespers when in concurrence with other feasts, the antiphons and Psalms in first Vespers being taken from the Saturday.

3. The rules regulating Vespers within the octave of the Nativity of our Lord remain unchanged.

TITULUS VI.

On Commemorations.

1. On doubles of the first class commemoration of the preceding office is not made, unless the latter be Sunday, even *per annum*, or a double of the first or second class, or the octave day of some primary feast of our Lord, or a day within a privileged octave, or a major feria. In occurring offices commemoration is made only of the Sunday, of whatever rite it be, a privileged octave and a

major feria. Of the following office (even when celebrated as a simple) commemoration is always to be made—but not of a day within a non-privileged octave or of a simple.

2. In doubles of the second class commemoration is always to be made of the preceding office, unless this be of a semi-double feast or of a day within a non-privileged octave. In cases of occurrence commemoration is made of every Sunday, of every double or semi-double reduced to a simple, of a privileged octave, or a major feria and of a vigil; but of a simple, commemoration is made only at Lauds and in private Masses. But of any following office, even a simple or one observed as a simple, commemoration is always to be made, and also of the day within the octave if the office of this is to be observed on the following day; and in that case with the antiphon and versicle and first Vespers of the feast.

3. Although the feasts of our Lord and their octave days have the privilege of prevailing over minor Sundays when they occur with these, still when several commemorations are to be made (remembering always that in the Vespers the first commemoration is of the concurring office whatever be its rite and dignity) the following order is to be observed both in Vespers and in Lauds and Mass: First, of the Sunday whatever its rank; second, of the day within the octave of Epiphany or Corpus Christi; third, of an octave day; fourth, of a major double; fifth, of a minor double; sixth, of a semi-double; seventh, of a day within a common octave; eighth, of the Friday after the octave of the Ascension; ninth, of a major feria; tenth, of a vigil; eleventh, of a simple.

TITULUS VII.

On the proper conclusion of hymns and on the proper Verse at Prime, on the Suffrages of the Saints, the Prayers, the Athanasian Creed and the third Oratio in Mass.

1. When on the same day there occur several offices which have a proper conclusion of the hymns or a proper verse at prime, the conclusion and verse to be said are those which are proper of the office which is recited on that day.

2. Henceforth, when the suffrages of the saints should be said, only one suffrage is to be recited according to the formula proposed in the ordinary of the new Psalter.

3. The Athanasian Creed is added at prime in the feast of the Holy Trinity and in the Sundays only after Epiphany and after Pentecost, when the office of these is to be followed, saving the exception made in the following paragraph.

4. When on a Sunday commemoration is made of any double office, or of an octave day, or of a day within an octave, the suffrage,

prayers, symbol *Quicumque* and the third oratio in the Mass are omitted.

TITULUS VIII.

On the Votive Office and on additional Offices.

1. Since by this new disposition of the Psalter the causes of the general indult of July 5, 1883, for votive offices, these offices and other similar ones granted by special indults are entirely removed and are pronounced to be removed.

2. So also ceases the obligation of reciting in choir, on the days prescribed by the Rubrics heretofore in force, the little office of the Blessed Virgin, the office of the dead and the gradual and penitential Psalms. But the chapters which are under obligation to recite these additional offices by reason of some special constitution or legally shall ask for the commutation of them by the Holy See.

3. On the feast of St. Mark and in the triduum of rogations the obligation of reciting the Litany of the Saints, even out of choir, still remains.

TITULUS IX.

On the Feasts of Dedication and of the Title of a Church and on the Patrons.

1. The feast of the dedication of every church is always primary and a feast of our Lord.

2. The anniversary of the dedication of a cathedral church and the titular feast of the same are to be celebrated with the rite of double of the first class with octave throughout the whole diocese by all the clergy, regular as well as secular, who use the diocesan calendar; and by regulars of both sexes living in the diocese who use their own calendar, as a double of the first class, but without an octave.

3. As the sacred Lateran Archbasilica is mother and head of all churches of the city and the world, both the anniversary of its dedication and the feast of the Transfiguration of our Lord, which, in addition to the great solemnity of the Resurrection of our Lord, is wont to be commemorated by it as titular, shall henceforth be celebrated as the double of the second class by all the clergy, secular and regular, including even those who follow some special rite.

4. The feast of the principal patron of a town, city, diocese, province or nation shall be celebrated as a double of the first class with octave by all clergy, secular and regular, who live therein and use the diocesan calendar; but by the regulars who live therein and use their own calendar the said feast, although never *feriatum*, shall be celebrated under the same rite, but without an octave.

TITULUS X.

On the Masses on Sundays and Ferias and on Masses for the Dead.

1. On Sundays, even minor ones, whatever feast occur, provided it be not a feast of our Lord or its octave day, or a double of the first or second class, the Mass of the Sunday shall always be said with commemoration of the feast. If the feast to be commemorated is a double, the third *Oratio* is to be omitted.

2. In the ferias of Lent, quartertense, second rogations and in vigils, if the office to be said is that of a double feast (but not of the first or second class) or a semi-double, private Masses may be said *ad libitum*, either of the feast with commemoration and last Gospel of the feria or vigil, or of the feria or vigil with commemoration of the feast; but private votive Masses or private Masses of the dead are forbidden on a feria, and these also are forbidden on a feria on which the Mass of the Sunday is to be anticipated or deferred. In Lent private Masses of the dead can be said only on the first week-day free in the calendar of the church in which the Mass is celebrated.

3. When in any place a feast hindered by a minor Sunday is celebrated *ex voto* or with frequentation of the people (of which the Ordinary shall be the judge) Masses of the said hindered feast can be celebrated, provided one Mass of the Sunday be not omitted. Whenever a Mass is sung or read out of the order of the office, if a commemoration is to be made of a Sunday or feria or vigil, the Gospel of these is also to be read at the end.

4. At the Mass of a Sunday, even a minor one, with commemoration of a double feast, major or minor, and of a day within an octave howsoever to be celebrated, the proper color of the Sunday is to be retained, with the preface of the Most Holy Trinity, unless when there is a proper preface of the season or that of the octave of a feast of our Lord.

5. The laws for sung Masses of the dead remain unchanged. Read Masses are permitted on doubles only on the day of the death, or for the day of the death, provided it be not a feast of obligation, or a double of the first or second class or a feria excluding doubles of the first class. As regards read Masses of the dead to be said on days of semi-double or simple rite, for the future they can never be celebrated on the ferias enumerated in No. 2, saving the exception admitted therein.

But it shall be lawful in such Masses of the feria to add the *Oratio pro Defunctis* for whom the Sacrifice is applied, in the last place but one, as the rubric of the Missal permits. But since for the application of the indulgences of the privileged altar, Masses of the dead should hitherto be celebrated *in nigris*, the Supreme

Pontiff has been pleased to grant said indulgences for the future, although the Mass of the feria be said with the *Oratio pro Defunctis*. In other ferias throughout the year not excepted in No. 2, as well as in semi-doubles, in days within non-privileged octaves and in simples, Masses of the dead as well as the other votive Masses can be said according to the Rubrics.

TITULUS XI.

On the Collects in Mass.

With reference to collects commanded by Ordinaries, they are henceforth forbidden (unless they be prescribed for some grave reason) not only on the vigils of the Nativity and of Pentecost and on doubles of the first class, but even on doubles of the second class, of the major Sundays within privileged octaves, and whenever in the Mass are to be said more than three *Orationes* prescribed on that day by the Rubrics.

TITULUS XII.

On Conventual Masses.

In churches in which there is the obligation of choir, only one Mass shall always be recited with the presence of the choir members and that of the office of the day, unless the Rubrics ordain otherwise; other Masses hitherto celebrated with the presence of the choir shall for the future be read *extra Chorum*, after the proper canonical hour; but exception from this rule is made for the Masses in *Litaniis majoribus et minoribus* and the Masses on the feast of the Nativity of Our Lord. So also exception is made for the Masses on the anniversaries of the creation and coronation of the Supreme Pontiff, of the election and consecration or translation of the Bishop, as well as on the anniversary of the latest deceased Bishop and of all the Bishops or Canons; and for all Masses *ex fundatione*.

TITULUS XIII.

On the Commemoration of All the Faithful Departed.

1. On the commemoration of all the faithful departed the office and Mass of the current day are to be omitted and only the office and Mass of the Dead are to be said as is prescribed in the appendix of the new Psalter.

2. If on November 2 there occur a Sunday or a double of the first class the commemoration of the dead shall be celebrated on the first following day not similarly hindered; on which, should a double of the second class chance to occur, this is transferred according to the rule laid down in Titulus III., n. 3.

TEMPORARY PRESCRIPTIONS.

I. The calendars of every diocese or order or congregation using

the Roman Breviary for the year 1913 shall absolutely be drawn up according to the rules above set forth.

II. On Sundays on which in the calendars for the coming year 1912 are inscribed, under double rite major and minor, feasts of the saints, or of the angels, or even of the Blessed Virgin Mary, or an octave day of feasts other than those of our Lord, both the office in private recitation and the read Masses shall be *ad libitum*, either as is given in the calendar of the year 1912 or of the Sunday with commemoration of the double, major or minor. Also in the ferias, concerning which in Titulus X., n. 2, private Masses can be celebrated as is there noted.

III. What has been laid down in Titulus XIII. of these Rubrics with regard to the commemoration of all the faithful departed is to be put into application absolutely from the year 1912.

IV. Until the new correction of the Roman Breviary and Missal decreed by our Most Holy Lord be published:

(a) Perpetual calendars are not to be sent to the Sacred Congregation of Rites for correction and approval;

(b) No petition is to be made to raise the degree of a rite or to introduce new feasts;

(c) As regards special feasts, either of the Blessed Virgin Mary or of saints or blessed, or double rite major or minor, assigned for Sundays, the local Ordinaries or the superiors of regulars are to prescribe that they be either commemorated in both Vespers, in Lauds and in the Mass, or provide, by presenting valid arguments to the Sacred Roman Congregation, for their transference to another day; or better they are to be omitted;

(d) No correction of the Rubrics having been made in the meanwhile, the rules above laid down are to be inserted in the new Breviaries and Missals after the General Rubrics, omitting the decrees of the S. R. C. hitherto inserted at the beginning of the Breviary;

(e) In future editions of the Breviary the following antiphons at Lauds are changed in consequence of the new reformation of the Breviary:

On Sexagesima Sunday: Ant. 5. In Excelsis* laudate Deum.

On the third Sunday of Lent: Ant. 3. Adhæsit anima mea* poste, Deus meus.

On the fourth Sunday of Lent: Ant. 4. Me suscepit* dextera tua, Domine.

On Thursday of Holy Week: Ant. 3. Tu autem, Domine* scis omne consilium eorum adversum me in mortem. Ant. 5. Fac, Domine,* judicium injuriis patientibus: et vias peccatorum disperde.

Book Reviews

THE CATECHIST; or, Headings and Suggestions for the Explanation of the Catechism of Christian Doctrine (No. 2). With Numerous Quotations and Examples from Scripture, and an Appendix of Anecdotes and Illustrations. By *Rev. George Edw. Howe*, author of "Sermon Plans." Sixth edition. Two vols., 8vo., pp. 658 and 680. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The following points and explanations, to which attention is respectfully invited, will show the aim and scope of the work:

1. At the outset it must be understood that "The Catechist" is in no sense a treatise on the Catechism. It is but a compilation, from various sources, of headings and points for explanation, suggestions made to the teacher, like so many pegs, whereon to hang developments of the text.

2. Hence brevity has been a chief aim in view, while it has also formed a chief difficulty, because of the danger of obscurity. Sentences are made short, without full grammatical expression, not merely for the sake of peace, but especially in order to concentrate the suggestions and make the whole appear, as far as possible, like a chart or map of ideas to the eye and memory of the catechist.

3. The publication is not intended to supersede all labor, but to put forth what may prove suggestive, and gather together, methodically and concisely, points under every question which the instructor may already know, but does not at the moment recall. It is hoped that this system of notes may save considerable time and trouble in reading up matter, without, however, dispensing with all need of preparation.

4. At the head of the various subjects references are given to works in which developments of the same may be found. It is by no means necessary to consult all these books; in most cases they are but repetitions of each other in different form; they are quoted here for the convenience of those who may possess them, or have one or two, and not the others. No reference, except for an occasional statement, is made to works of Theology, it being presumed that each one, according to need, will consult his own authors, whether in Dogma or Morals.

5. The references and quotations from Holy Scripture are very numerous, and it is hoped they will be found correct and exact. Experience shows how great is the inconvenience and the loss of time entailed by inaccuracy of reference, common in some books, especially in those printed abroad; every care, therefore, has been bestowed on this item. Yet with over 1,300 quotations, and more than 1,000 examples from Old and New Testaments, it may easily be that, in spite of all, some inaccuracy may have slipped in.

6. As to examples and illustrations: these also will be found very numerous, drawn from a variety of sources. At first, while the manuscript was progressing, mere references were made to the books from which they were taken. But it soon became evident that such a course must be useless to those who did not possess such books, or else involve them in considerable outlay if they wished to procure them. It was suggested, therefore, that the only plan to follow in this case would be to gather together all the examples into an Appendix and make all references to that. This idea has been followed up, as the only rational way out of the difficulty; it has, however, increased the size and consequent expense of this work, yet it will make it more complete in itself, and dispense with all need of the others.

7. As these anecdotes and examples have not to be *read* to the audience, they have usually been abbreviated and summarized, giving only the chief points of the story, which each one will enlarge and clothe as he deems best for the occasion. Some among them may appear somewhat trivial and unsuitable; but they are not all intended for all occasions. What might be considered as unbecoming the pulpit might be found suitable to the classroom; and what might seem childish and out of place with adults, interesting and in keeping in lessons given to children.

8. Besides the illustration given in the Appendix, over a thousand more are quoted from the different Books of Holy Scripture, for which references are given. These the catechist can interweave with the lesson, putting authoritative examples of vice or virtue in living form. This will not only add weight to his words, as well as lighten the instruction, but will also help to give to his hearers an outline of some of the chief events and personages in Holy Writ, of which perhaps there is too great ignorance nowadays. Thus Bible History will become truly the handmaid of the Catechism; the two should be used together.

9. Headings and ideas for explanation are given under all the answers of the textbook, and parts of answers, uniformity of treatment being aimed at. It will be admitted, however, that while some subjects are more important than others, they may also lend themselves more readily to development and have sometimes received more, which, while unnecessary in some circumstances, may be found useful in others. Any points considered too long and intricate for children's lessons may be shortened at discretion, and yet may prove useful for adult congregations or serve as points for sermons on the respective subjects.

10. Sundry items, not referred to in the Catechism itself, are here introduced, as closely related to those that are, and as of

advantage to be explained to the Faithful; an index of these will be found at the end, referring to the numbers of the questions to which they belong, or after which they will naturally find their place; *e. g.*, the Seal of Confession, never mentioned in the Catechism, should be treated of and will naturally come after the definition of Confession. Q. 295. Subjects directly spoken of in the text itself will not be referred to in the index, but must be sought for in their respective places, *e. g.*, *Purgatory*, under the Ninth Article of the Creed; *Anger*, under the Fifth Commandment.

II. A number of Saints' names are given throughout the work, without any explanation or reference; this simply means they are considered as examples of the virtue or subject then being treated of; details of such virtue will be found in their lives, under date of the feast day of each one as given.

The Catechist who uses this book will be well equipped and cannot fail for lack of material. But he must be willing to unite the various parts of his subject and supply the language for the presentation of the truths he wants to teach according to the capacity of his hearers. For such a one the book is well-nigh perfect. We cannot think of anything that it lacks.

FATHER LACOMBE: *The Black Robe Voyageur*. By *Katherine Hughes*, with a Preface by Sir William C. Van Horne. 8vo., pp. 467. Illustrated. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co.

The announcement says: This biographical story of Pere Lacombe is written from the standpoint of historical and human interest. It opens with pictures of life in old Quebec; from 1849 onward it deals mainly with the West.

The story of this remarkable man's life touches on St. Paul as a collection of log cabins, Fort Garry as a trading post, Fort Edmonton as the centre of the Saskatchewan and Athabasca fur trade, Calgary as a frontier police post, while in and out it winds through life on the Canadian plains as they evolve from Indian and Buffalo ranges to autonomous Provinces intercepted by railways. The subject—strong, humorous and dominant—passes with a great joy of life from one dramatic experience to another in the wilderness and on to the crowded life of big cities, where he still refuses to be commonplace. He is always a knight-errant of charity, a raconteur *par excellence*, a genius for friendship, a diplomat among diplomats. The book is a concise and human picture of the making of the West.

Archbishop Ireland says of Father Lacombe:

"He is one of the most remarkable men—decidedly the most remarkable priest—Western America has ever seen. His long

career as a missionary, beginning away back in 1849, continuing even unto our own days, and destined, we fondly hope, to continue into many years to come, has been a special gift of Providence to country and to Church, on account of his fruitful personal labors, and no less on account of the wholesome inspirations arising from it—bidding others to approximate, though they may not attain, the high ideal which he not only held before his mind, but which he actually realized in his own self. The love of God and of souls was throughout his career the dominant motive in all he thought, in all he did, in all he suffered. Co-operating with this, exalted and intensified with it, were the natural gifts rarely seen on such high planes of mind and heart—intelligence, practical sense, utter forgetfulness of self, utter good will in the service of others. Not only he willed much and planned much, but—a good fortune not always coming to most worthy ambitions—he accomplished much.

“As the apostle and civilizer of savage tribes, as the explorer of vast wildernesses, and the pathfinder of incoming new populations, he has been without an equal. His name is linked indissolubly with the early history of Western Canada as that of one of its most illustrious founders; his fame and the sweet odor of his apostolic zeal and good works should be made to spread over the whole continent of America.”

The author thus describes her method of gathering material for the book:

Father Lacombe’s peculiarly vivid intellect—which even yet seizes upon every detail in events and people that touch on his life—holds the past as in a mirror. To avail myself of this knowledge in securing quite accurate pictures of early Western periods and incidents, I have for some years submitted this venerable man month after month to what he laughingly termed “inquisitions.” Some others of the few Old-Timers remaining have likewise submitted to my “inquisitions,” and generously contributed to my knowledge of details.

This picture of Father Lacombe by one who saw him for the first time is worth reproducing:

“Near the Lake of the Woods at sunrise one morning in 1882 I saw a priest standing on a flat rock, his crucifix in his right hand and his broad hat in the other, silhouetted against the rising sun, which made a golden halo about him, talking to a group of Indians—men, women and papposes—who were listening with reverent attention. It was a scene never to be forgotten, and the noble and saintly countenance of the priest brought it to me that it must be Father Lacombe of whom I had heard so much; and it was.”

We feel that nothing more need be said to convince the reader

that we have here an important book. Subject, time, location, events—all combine to make it charming biography and valuable history.

HISTORY OF POPE BONIFACE VIII. AND HIS TIMES, WITH NOTES AND DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE. In six books. By *Don Louis Tosti*, Benedictine Monk of Monte Cassino. Translated from the Italian by Right Rev. Mgr. Eugene J. Donnelly, V. F., Pastor of St. Michael's Church, Flushing, Long Island. 8vo., pp. 546. New York: Christian Press Association.

The translator's preface makes the best introduction for this book. He says: "A backward glance through the history of the Middle Ages may show us not a few majestic figures among the Popes, but none so striking and remarkable as that of Boniface VIII. Surrounded by stern and simple times, he appeals to us with peculiar directness because of the almost universal and lasting denunciation of historians, both of his own and later times. The history of the Church during these times is wholly a history of the struggle of the Papacy against the supremacy of the Imperial power. Some Popes more than others are distinguished for the bold resistance they showed to this unjust assumption and strove to maintain the rights of the Church, among whom are to be particularly mentioned Alexander III., Gregory VII., Innocent III. and Boniface VIII.

"Pope Boniface VIII. deserves to be called the last Pope of the Middle Ages. It was during his Pontificate that the temporal power of the Holy See was, for the first time, attacked by France, and the prestige of the Papacy was subjected to the most violent outrages. He was a great mediæval Pope. His figure can be justly compared with that of Innocent III. or Gregory IX. Like them, he solemnly affirmed the Pontifical authority; like them, he fought princes with a stubbornness which alone equaled the consciousness he had of his own rights. By his sumptuous ceremonies, by his striking and eloquent Bulls, he manifested to the world the grandeur and power of the Papacy. The Pontificate of Boniface VIII. is the beginning of a transition period; it exhibits the sinking of the Papal power and the rising of the secular State-idea hostile to the Church. The subordination of the secular under the spiritual order was denied. The See of Peter was shaken, but not destroyed.

"The chief reproaches that are brought against Boniface VIII. relate to the abdication of Celestine V.; his own election to the Papacy; the imprisonment of Celestine V.; the quarrel that arose between him and the Colonna family, and Philip the Fair. But all these charges will be met and explained to the reader during his perusal of this history. Moreover, the moral portraits of Boniface and Philip the Fair being traced, there is no doubt that ap-

proaching them nearer in order to observe their conduct in the famous quarrel, the truth will be seen more plainly and more easily."

A justification for the translation of Tosti's *Life of Boniface* is found in these words:

"But he has found some apologists and defenders, and among them the first place is to be given to the celebrated Benedictine of Monte Cassino, Dom Louis Tosti. This historian is among the foremost of Italy whose various works have been favorably received everywhere, and have made him renowned for splendid historical attainments. His work, 'The Life and Times of Boniface VIII.,' which we present to the public in an English dress, is an admirable and effective defense of that Pope.

"In it he breathes the true spirit of a historian; he neither apologizes nor does he advance a proof without producing documentary evidence from the most approved sources. In the compilation of this work Tosti had access to many unpublished documents in the Vatican Archives, and to have drawn from them much information of the greatest value."

Monsignor Donnelly's knowledge of the Italian tongue, acquired by years of residence in Rome, and supplemented by years of study, together with his well-known ability and scholarly attainments, fit him unusually well to act as translator for so distinguished an author and so important a subject. The book is very valuable.

PRIMITIVE CATHOLICISM. By *Monsignor Battifol, Litt. D.* Translated by Henri L. Brianceau, of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, from the fifth French edition of "*L'Eglise Naissante.*" Revised by the author. 8vo., pp. 424. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

"The subject I am proposing to treat, and which, if God permit, I intend at some future day to pursue down to the epoch of St. Augustine and St. Leo, is the history of the formation of Catholicism, that is to say, of the Church in so far as it is a visible, universal society, built upon the framework of a rule of faith and a hierarchy.

"In the present volume on 'Primitive Catholicism' I study the origins of this formation, taking the time of St. Cyprian as the term of these origins. It might indeed be contended that their real term was reached more than half a century before his time, but his writings and the discussions in which he took a leading part show so clearly that the doctrines and institutions of Catholicism were then generally accepted, and, on the other hand, the historical continuity that had governed the development of these doctrines and institutions up to his day, makes itself so sensibly felt in these same writings that they complete for us in an admirable

manner the knowledge we are able to acquire of the two hundred years of previous Christianity.

We must confess, however, that it is not without some timidity we approach the study of these two centuries of primitive history, seeing that the documentary evidence, abundant as it is, gives us but a faint idea of the early Christian life, so varied, so complex, so deep! How much light we should be deprived of had not the epistles of St. Ignatius and the Apologies of St. Justin been preserved!"

This is one of the really important books of the year. At a time when men are more divided than ever before on the subject of religion, when these divisions are producing the inevitable result of driving men away from religion altogether, and when the thinking Protestant world is praying for and striving for union, how consoling for the Catholic and how startling for the Protestant to hear a man of Monsignor Battifol's scholarly attainments and acknowledged ability lay down the thesis, "Christianity was born Catholic, for there is identity of structure between apostolic Christianity and the Christianity of about the year 200."

How well he has succeeded in proving it we may learn on the testimony of Professor Harnack, to which the author himself appeals. Harnack says: "The author has rendered to his Church a most signal service, for one could not undertake with greater special knowledge of the subject to establish the original identity of Christianity, Catholicism and the Roman primacy. He does not seek to prove his thesis by means of metahistoric speculation which does not concern itself with the chronology of events, but confines himself to the territory of facts and their consequences, and seeks to furnish a truly historical demonstration. That *Roman* and *Catholic* are identical I proved as a Protestant historian some twenty years ago, in my 'History of Dogma,' though with certain reserves which the author strives, of course, to discard in most cases." Professor Harnack earnestly recommends those Protestants who are interested in the history of the Church not to overlook this work, but to study it thoroughly. We believe that we may safely offer the same recommendation to Catholics. The result will be knowledge, and an increase of faith, hope and charity.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline and History of the Catholic Church. In fifteen volumes. Vol. XII., Philip—Revalidation. New York: Robert Appleton Company.

As this master work draws near to completion one is tempted to think that the feature of its making which will excite most

wonder in the future is the remarkable promptness that marked its progress from beginning to end. We use the word promptness and not haste, because the former is a virtue and the latter may be a vice. There is no mark of haste about the book. But when we consider that the editorial staff was formed for this purpose without any experience of this kind as a body, and perhaps even as individuals; that the publishing organization came into existence for this special work; that the financial plan had to be evolved and perfected; that the world had to be searched for contributors, whose merits had to be weighed and whose previous work had to be examined in order that the best might be selected for each particular subject, the wonder grows that so very much has been so well nigh perfectly accomplished in so short a time.

The comprehensiveness of the work is becoming more strikingly apparent as the end draws near. Of course, every one knows that there is no perfectly comprehensive encyclopedia in the strict sense of the work, as there is no perfect university, and therefore it is not surprising to hear some reader say that he has been disappointed when he consulted the book or to read that some reviewer has noticed the absence of one or two subjects.

Probably all thinking men will agree that the encyclopedia which contains all the subjects which by common consent should be included, treated as fully as possible, with due allowance for their relative importance, may truthfully be said to be comprehensive. We must remember that there may be a difference of opinion as to the subjects that ought to be treated, and even the most careful editing may overlook something that is entitled to a place. With this understanding, it must be admitted that the Catholic Encyclopedia is a remarkably comprehensive book, and that it will really be a Catholic library in itself.

The importance of the work has been strongly emphasized recently, when a new edition of the largest and most important of the secular encyclopedias came from the press. The editors and managers laid special stress on the fairness with which they intended to treat Catholic subjects, and made a special bid for Catholic patronage. Alas, how far short of the promise was the reality! It has been shown that it is so unfair, so unreliable, as to be unworthy of encouragement and unsafe for reading. This confirms what experience had already shown, that a Catholic encyclopedia is strictly necessary for Catholic students, and indeed for all students, whether Jew, Gentile or pagan, who want the truth about the Catholic Church.

To speak of the importance of the subjects in the twelfth volume is but to repeat what has been said of each of the preceding vol-

umes. Each one seems most important until the next one appears. The truth is it is impossible to make a comparison. Every volume has a value all its own, and each one is a unit of a series that when complete will be invaluable.

OTHER SHEEP I HAVE. By *Theodore Christian*. The Proceedings of the Celestial Commission of Church Unity. 8vo., pp. 385. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"This volume is written in the interest of church union. In a discussion that the author represents as being held before a heavenly moderator, the beliefs of the several denominations of the Christian Church are subjected to a critical analysis, and compromises, where possible, are suggested. The author has spared no effort to present, in all its phases, the complicated and important subject to which he has devoted his attention for a long period of years."

The author represents himself as taken up into the seventh heaven somewhat after the manner of St. Paul, and there seeing a messenger appointed by the Supreme Being to go down to earth in answer to the prayers which have been sent up to heaven for church unity. The messenger comes down accompanied by the author and by Peace and Charity, and the investigation begins. Representatives of all the churches appear, and try to sustain their own claims while discrediting the claims of others. The various virtues appear, personified, and try to preserve peace and bring about unity.

Although the opinions expressed and arguments used seem to be those of imaginary persons, they are not so, but are quotations from actual, well-known individuals. Concerning this the author says:

"In the following pages certain opinions expressed by imaginary characters in the work are really the opinions of learned authorities in the churches represented by the speakers, or of persons of the type of character depicted, credit for which is given by footnotes. These have not been put in quotation marks, in order to give the impression that the words emanate from the character who utters them, that the continuity of the story may not be interrupted and that the reader may not be confused. Some of these quotations are in the exact words of the original."

The whole thing is ingeniously done, but one might reasonably ask at the end, *cui bono*? While the author does not draw any final conclusions from the discussion, he seems to think that church unity is neither possible nor necessary. He closes with this prescription for this disunion which the Doctor has prescribed, which the Moderator had placed in the custody of Charity, and which the latter charged the author to read on earth and make public:

"Of May (not Must) a great deal.

"Of Moderation (not Excess) the proper amount.

"Of Inclusiveness (not Exclusiveness) a sufficient quantity.

"Of Love (of first purity, if you are fortunate enough to find it), more than all combined.

"Apply personally, in these proper proportions, and gradually."

We are quite sure that every one who has ever thought of church unity at all will claim that he has been using this prescription from the beginning, and yet the child is as sick as ever. *Cui bono?*

THE CRUX OF PASTORAL MEDICINE. *The Perils of Embryotic Man.* By *Rev. Andrew Klarmann, A. M.* Fourth enlarged edition. 12mo., pp. 283. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co.

It is surely a healthy sign of the times that a book like this, treating of a subject which should interest all men, on which all should agree and which lies at the very deepest foundations of society, has in so short a time reached a fourth edition. Unfortunately, society generally has gone far astray on this subject, and even to get men to consider at all the orthodox view of the law of God and the law of nature, which regulate the whole subject and which are as clear as crystal, is much to be thankful for. As has been well said by the author:

"There is no more burning question at the present time than the one which has called forth this book. The future of society, the future of the nation depend on the right understanding and the faithful observance of God's holy fundamental laws on the relations of the sexes and the generation of the human race. No nation can prosper that violates these laws, and the individuals that compose it bring upon themselves misery here and hereafter. The warnings against race suicide are becoming louder every day, and laws that prevent it in its more flagrant forms are being more strictly enforced in all well-regulated communities, but something more is needed to stay the blighting evil. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the further we get away from that wholesome fear the nearer we draw to the precipice.

Our greatest hope for the correction of this evil lies with the doctors. We abstract, of course, from spiritual aid, and consider the physician not only as a healer of the body, but as a teacher of right ethics. If we can get our physicians to understand the enormous responsibility that rests on them in shaping the morals of their patients while treating their bodies, we shall have made long strides forward in this battle with sin in its worst form."

In this, the fourth edition, three new chapters have been added, which elucidate, with equal brevity and thoroughness, the three most

modern and urgent questions of this subject, recently discussed with much spirit by professional champions on both sides. The author summarizes the results of these discussions and tests them on the edge of logic and philosophy.

We cheerfully repeat what we said about the first edition:

"The work is brief and to the point, and it deals with very important questions in a clear, straightforward manner. What is still better, it answers those questions. We have frequently heard conscientious physicians and medical students inquire for some brief work of this kind, and we hope that the present work will find its way into their hands."

SOCIAL FRANCE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By *Cécile Hugon*, Sometime Scholar of Somerville College, Oxford. With twelve illustrations. 8vo., pp. 321. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.

The author thus introduces the subject: "The seventeenth century is a peculiarly baffling one, because it appears on the surface so simple. It is simple because the *Memoires* dealing with the upper classes are as excellent as they are numerous; it is difficult to understand because the peasant and the tradesman of the period Vatican Archives, and has drawn from them much information about themselves.

"*L'état, c'est moi*," is a truism which has become a household word; but a too ready acceptance of it as a truth places the student on the wrong road at the very outset of his pilgrimage. Never was a more heterogeneous collection of ideals, precepts and codes of morals presented for the acceptance of a nation than at this time. Never did nation comport itself in a more interesting manner than the French while engaged in the process of selection and of coördinating the matter selected. Hence it follows that the subject of this book is a very wide one, and I cannot claim to have dealt with even one section of it in full. The only aim of this sketch has been to represent the general aspect of the century in a few rough strokes, here and there filled in, but more often left bare.

"It deals chiefly with the minor ideals and hopes of mankind which form the principal difference between one age and another. We share the larger ambitions of our fathers, but we do not enjoy the same things. The political history of the period is so complicated, and at the same time so closely bound up with the domestic life of the nation, that a brief historical introduction appeared necessary. This summary of political events is only meant to serve as a help to the understanding of social conditions otherwise, perhaps, unintelligible."

Then follows the Introduction, to which fifteen pages are given.

Larger space is naturally given to the distinguished women who The book is excellent and interesting, both in matter and treatment. gathered about the Court of Louis XIV. and became more or less prominent during his reign. History shows that they were worldly and frivolous in many cases to a shocking degree, and yet that they possessed great strength of character when put to the test in time of pestilence.

If the sketches of the people in general and their everyday life are briefer, they are not less interesting or complete, and are brought out with sufficient clearness to perfect the picture.

The book is splendidly made, and both author and publisher are to be congratulated.

EPITOME E GRADUALI S. R. E. De Tempore et De Sanctis. SS. D. N. Pii X. Pontificis Maximi jussu Restituto et Editio. Cui addita sunt Festa Novissima. Editio Ratisbonensis juxta Vaticanam. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

It is always a pleasure to take up the liturgical publications of the house of Pustet and to bring them to the attention of others. Their knowledge, their experience, their equipment, their good taste and their sense of responsibility—all guarantee the best in every sense of the word. It is probably more true of liturgical books than of any other class of publications that those who use them depend almost entirely on the publishers. The technical knowledge required to make them and to test them is possessed by a few persons only, and unless the publishers are thoroughly reliable and conscientious, the liturgy of the Church will fail of its purpose.

The book before us is a splendid example of the right way, and its adoption and use will ensure correctness and edification in the conduct of the church service.

PRACTICAL HANDBOOK FOR THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE AND OF BIBLE LITERATURE. By *Dr. Michael Seisenberger*, Professor at the Royal Lyceum at Freising. Translated from the sixth German edition by A. M. Buchanan, M. A., and edited by the Rev. Thomas J. Gerrard. With maps and illustrations. One volume, large octavo, cloth, net, \$2.00. New York: Joseph F. Wagner.

By way of introduction: "This book is offered to the English-speaking people as a small contribution towards the realization of the great and noble aims of the reigning Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius X. The heroic stand which he has made for the preservation of the Word of God commands at once the sympathy and admiration of all the faithful. Just as in the realm of philosophy he has insisted on the true personality and dignity of a man, and as in theology on the true transcendence and majesty of God, so also has he in the realm of Biblical science insisted on the divine char-

acter of the inspired Word. . . . A translation of Dr. Seisenberger's work has been asked for, as providing a bird's-eye view of the Biblical question from the Catholic standpoint, suitable to the exigencies of the present day. It is a handbook for the hard-worked parochial clergy. It is an introduction for the seminary student. Yet, although it is merely a synopsis, it is enriched on every page with ample references to the more specialized works—a detailed list of which is appended to the book—so that the reader who wishes to pursue any given subject more deeply has the material at hand without further search."

It is hard to imagine a more excellent book of its kind, and its importance is unquestionable. Our Biblical literature is not nearly full enough, and we have had to depend entirely too much on non-Catholic authors for information on Biblical subjects. We shall not have to do so any longer in this particular respect, for Dr. Seisenberger's Handbook is comprehensive, clear, accurate and interesting. It will abundantly satisfy every demand for a work of this kind.

NEW BREVIARIES.
NEW PSALTER.

Since the revisions of the Breviary all clerics are interested in publishers' announcements concerning new editions. It is true that the new order does not oblige until 1913, but as each individual is free to adopt it at once if he wishes, there is a general desire to know just what the new order means in practice. As far as we know, the only new breviaries and psalters printed so far have come from the Vatican, and even these have not been on sale in this country. The only other positive announcements that we have seen have been made by the Society of St. John in Belgium and by the Mechlin publishers. We are informed by B. Herder, of Freiburg and St. Louis, that he is not prepared to announce new editions at present, but that he is now taking orders for the publications of the Society of St. John and Dessain, of Mechlin, to be filled very soon.

Benziger Brothers also announce the publications of the same houses, and are receiving orders to be filled at the earliest possible moment.

Fr. Pustet & Co. do not announce new editions of their own, but they are also receiving orders for the other publications. They announce the New Vatican Psalter at \$1, and as it is possible to use any Breviary with the new Psalter as a key, they offer twenty per cent. discount on all Breviaries and present a copy of the Psalter to each purchaser. "The Ecclesiastical Review" announces that it hopes to print the new Ordo in its March number.

